This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at http://books.google.com/

,960

1837
ARTES VERITAS SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
TUEBOR
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BR
65
.P5
V3

1837
ARTES VERITAS SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

THREE LETTERS

119131

OF PHILOXENUS

BISHOP OF MABBÔGH (485-519):

BEING THE LETTER TO THE MONKS,
THE FIRST LETTER TO THE MONKS OF BETH-GAUGAL,
AND THE LETTER TO EMPEROR ZENO;

EDITED

FROM SYRIAC MANUSCRIPTS IN THE VATICAN LIBRARY, WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION, AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LIFE, WORKS, AND DOCTRINES OF PHILOXENUS, A THEOLOGICAL GLOSSARY, AND AN APPENDIX OF BIBLE QUOTATIONS;

BY

ARTHUR ADOLPHE VASCHALDE,

Member of the Society of the Priests of St. Basil, Licentiate of Theology.

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY
OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

ROMA

TIPOGRAFIA DELLA R. ACCADEMIA DEI LINCEI

PROPRIETÀ DEL CAV. V. SALVIUCCI

1902

FACULTAS PHILOSOPHIAE

N° 2.

TO THE VERY REVEREND

NOEL DVRAND

SIXTH SVPERIOR GENERAL

OF THE SOCIETY OF THE PRIESTS

OF SAINT BASIL

BIOGRAPHY

The author of this dissertation, ARTHUR ADOLPHE VASCHALDE was born March 10, 1871, at Saint-Pons, department of Ardèche, France. After a preparatory training in the public school of his native town, he followed the academic courses at St. Barbe's College, Annonay, in the same department. Coming to Canada in 1888, he took up the study of Theology at Assumption College, Sandwich. There in 1892 he entered the Society of the Priests of Saint Basil. In the fall of 1893 he matriculated at the Catholic University of America, where he pursued the courses of Holy Scripture under Prof. C. P. Grannan, and of Semitic Languages under Prof. H. Hyvernat, and he received the degree of Licentiate of Theology in 1895. After teaching Mental Philosophy at Sandwich for five years, he returned to the University in 1900, to continue the study of Semitic Languages under Prof. H. Hyvernat and of Philosophy under Prof. E. A. Pace.

PREFACE

With the heresy known as Jacobite Monophysitism are associated some of the greatest names in Syriac history and literature, such as Philoxenus (Aksᵉnāyā) of Mabbôgh (+ 523), Severus of Antioch (+ 537), John of Tellā (+ 538), Jacob of Serūgh (+ 521), Jacob Baradaeus (+ 578), and many others. Although this heresy was named after Jacob Baradaeus, the founder of the Jacobite Church, its origin can be traced to the reaction which, in the latter half of the fifth century, set in against the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, and against the definition of the Council of Chalcedon respecting the existence of the two natures in Christ. Philoxenus was one of the foremost leaders in that great movement and, beyond question, the ablest champion of the new faith. The extracts from his works in the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Assemani and the recent publications of Guidi, Frothingham and Budge, leave no doubt on this point. Yet, outside of Budge's chapter on the creed of Philoxenus, but little has been written on the doctrines of the famous bishop of Mabbôgh, and, in our manuals of Church history and of dogmatic Theology, all the information which we possess about the life and teachings of Philoxenus is derived almost exclusively from Greek writers of the Byzantine period.

Such information, however, ought to be supplemented by a comparison with the Syriac sources; for it is but fair to let the original documents speak for themselves. Hence, as a small contribution to the literature of this interesting subject, we give here for the first time the Syriac text and the English translation of three important letters of Philoxenus: the Letter to the Monks, the first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal, and the Letter to Emperor Zeno. It has been thought that these documents, if published and translated in their entirety and taken in connection with what has already been done, would throw more light on the doctrines of Philoxenus than could be obtained heretofore. To emphasize this method, an appendix has been added giving a concordance of the principal theological terms and expressions used by the author; this, we trust, will be useful to such as may wish to pursue the same course with regard to Syrian Monophysitism. In another appendix the Bible quotations, occurring in the text, have been compared with the Peshitta, following in this the laudable example of Budge in his beautiful edition of the Discourses of Philoxenus. To this we have added a list of the few words borrowed from the Greek, which occur in these three letters.

If circumstances permit, this work will be followed by the publication of other texts of the same author; in the meantime, this modest effort will be amply repaid, if it directs the attention of others to the necessity of studying Jacobite Monophysitism in the writings of those who are best qualified to speak for it, namely, the Syriac Monophysite writers of the fifth and sixth centuries.

It is now my pleasing duty to thank Prof. Hyvernat for the care with which he directed my Oriental studies, not only during the four years I spent in his Department, but also during the five years I was absent from the University. I am besides under obligation to him for placing at my disposal the

Syriac text of these three letters which he copied himself from the Vatican Manuscripts.

I may not close without expressing my gratitude to Prof. Guidi, of Rome, and to Professors Grannan, Shahan and Pace, of this University who kindly consented to examine this dissertation before it was printed and offered many valuable suggestions.

To Prof. Guidi I am also indebted for a description of Syr. Mss. 135, 136, and 138 of the Vatican library, and also for the anonymous notice on Philoxenus which he transcribed for me from Syr. Ms. 155 of the Vatican. He had also the kindness to read the proof-sheets of this dissertation and took the trouble to correct the Syriac text on the original Manuscripts in the Vatican Library, thus ensuring, even in the apparently most trifling details of punctuation, an accuracy too often wanted in similar publications.

The Catholic University of America,

February, 1902.

A. A. VASCHALDE.

Journal Asiatique, Paris (E. Leroux), 9th series, t. XIV, XV, XVI.
KRÜGER (G.). — *Monophysitische Streitigkeiten im Zusammenhange mit der Reichspolitik*, Iena (Pohle), 1884.
LABBE-MANSI. — *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 30 vol., Florence, 1759-1792.
MARIN (Abbé). — *Les Moines de Constantinople depuis la fondation de la ville jusqu'à la mort de Photius*, Paris (V. Lecoffre), 1897.
MARTIN (P.). — *Syro-Chaldaicae Institutiones*, Paris (Maisonneuve), 1873.
MIGNE. — *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 67, 77, 86, 86 bis, 94, 108, 121.
— *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 1, 2, 41, 48, 54, 58, 68, 78.
NEALE. — *A History of the holy eastern Church; the patriarchate of Alexandria*, 2 vol., London (J. Masters), 1847.
PETAVIUS. — *Dogmata theologica*, ed. J. B. Fournials, 8 vol., Paris (L. Vivès), 1865-1867.
LE QUIEN. — *Oriens Christianus*, 3 vol., Paris, 1740.
RENAUDOT. — *Historia patriarcharum alexandrinorum jacobitarum*, Paris (Fournier), 1713.
— *Liturgiarum Orientalium collectio*, 2a ed., 2 vol., Frankfurt on the Main (J. Baer), 1847.
La Revue Catholique de Louvain, Louvain, 1843 sqq.
RITTER. — *Erdkunde im Verhältniss zur Natur und zur Geschichte des Menschen*, 2d ed., 19 vol., Berlin (Reimer), 1822-1859.
ROTHSTEIN. — *Die Dynastie der Laḫmiden von al-Hira*, Berlin Reuther n. Reichard, 1899.
SMITH and WACE. — *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 4 vol., Boston (Little, Brown & C°), 1877-1887.
TILLEMONT. — *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, 16 vol., Venise (F. Pitteri), 1732.
— *Histoire des Empereurs et des autres princes remarquables qui ont régné durant les six premiers siècles de l'Église*, Venise (F. Pitteri) 1732.
VACANT. — *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, Paris (Letouzey et Ané), 1901.
WALLIS-BUDGE. — *The Discourses of Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbôgh*, A. D. 485-519, *edited from Syriac Manuscripts of the sixth and seventh centuries in the British Museum, with an English translation.* Vol. I, Syriac text; vol. II, Introduction, translation, etc. London (Asher & C°), 1894.
WRIGHT (W. J.). *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since the year 1838*, t. I-III, London, 1870-1872.
— Article *Syriac Literature* in the Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th ed. (2d edit., a short History of Syriac Literature, London, A. Ch. Black, 1894).
— *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite*, Cambridge, 1882.
Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig, vol. 30, 35, 53.
ZOTENBERG (H.). — *Catalogue des Manuscrits Syriaques et Sabéens de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris (Imprimerie nationale), 1874.

CONTENTS

PART FIRST

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I. — THE LIFE OF PHILOXENUS.

1.	Sources	PAG.	1
2.	Early Life of Philoxenus	»	3
3.	Philoxenus at Edessa	»	6
4.	His Struggle with Calandion	»	9
5.	His Appointment to Mabbôgh	»	13
6.	His Struggle with Flavian	»	15
7.	His Exile and Death	»	19
8.	Various Judgments on Philoxenus	»	20

CHAPTER II. — THE PUBLISHED WORKS OF PHILOXENUS.

9.	The Discourses and other Texts	PAG.	25
10.	The Letter to Abu-Nafir	»	29
11.	The Letter concerning Stephen Bar Sudaili	»	33
12.	The Letter to the Monks of Teleda	»	34

CHAPTER III. — THE DOCTRINES OF PHILOXENUS.

A) His Doctrine on the Incarnation.

13.	General Considerations	PAG.	38
14.	Philoxenus and Nestorius	»	40

15. Heresy of Nestorius . . . . PAG. 41
16. The Word Θεοτόκος . . . . » 42
17. Communicatio Idiomatum . . . . » 44
18. Union of the Natures . . . . » 46
19. Consequences of Nestorius' Theory . . . . » 47
20. Philoxenus and Eutyches . . . . » 50
21. Heresy of Eutyches . . . . » 51
22. Manner of Union . . . . » 53
23. Monotheletism . . . . » 56
24. Reality of the Body of Christ . . . . » 57
25. Other Consequences of the Eutychian Theory . . . . . . » 61
26. Theory of Philoxenus on the Sufferings of Christ . . . . » 66
27. Summing up of the Doctrine of Philoxenus . . . . » 68
28. Philoxenus and Original Sin . . . . » 69
29. Philoxenus and the Blessed Virgin . . . . » 70

B) His Doctrine on the Trinity.

30. Three Persons and one Nature . . . . PAG. 71
31. Equality and Consubstantiality of the Persons . . . . . » 72
32. Eternal Generation of the Son . . . . » 73
33. Procession of the Holy Ghost . . . . » 74

C) His Doctrine on the Real Presence.

34. [Our Lord really present in the Holy Eucharist] . . . . » 76

PART SECOND

CHAPTER I.

35. Description of the Manuscripts . . . . PAG. 81

CHAPTER II. — INTRODUCTION TO THE THREE LETTERS.

A.

36. The Letter to the Monks: Title, date, analysis . . . . . » 83

B.

37. The first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal: Title, date, analysis . . . . » 87

C.

38. The Letter to Zeno: Title, date, analysis . . . . » 90

CHAPTER III. — ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

A.

The Letter to the Monks . . . . PAG. 93

B.

The first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal. . » 105

C.

The Letter to Zeno . . . . » 118

PART THIRD

SYRIAC TEXT.

A.

The Letter to the Monks . . . . PAG. 127

B.

The first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal . » 146

C.

The Letter to Zeno . . . . » 163

APPENDICES.

I. An anonymous Notice on Philoxenus . . . . PAG. 175
II. Theological Glossary . . . . » 177
III. Bible Quotations compared with the Peshitta and the Codex Sinaiticus . . . . » 183
Greek words occurring in the three letters . . . . . . » 190

PART FIRST

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE LIFE OF PHILOXENUS.

Sources.

1. The material available for a biography of Philoxenus is not very abundant. Little is known, especially of his early life. Yet he was a prominent leader in the great movement which took place in Syria in the fifth and sixth centuries against the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, and against the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, a movement which resulted in the peculiar heresy known by the name of Monophysitism *in specie* (1) or Jacobite Monophysitism (2).

The few facts which we possess regarding Philoxenus' career are derived from sources which may be divided into two classes: Syriac and non-Syriac. The principal non-Syriac sources consist of short passages in the works of Theodore the Reader (3),

(1) Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. II, p. 564.

(2) This heresy is still professed not only by the Jacobites of Syria, but also by the dissident Copts, Armenians, and Abyssinians (cf. Adolphe d'Avril, *Documents relatifs aux Eglises d'Orient*, ch. III).

(3) Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* (*P. G.*), vol. 86, p. 216.

Victor Tununensis [1], Evagrius [2], Theophanes [3], and Cedrenus [4]. These writers, however, do not always present independent testimony, for some of them often merely copied their predecessors [5].

The Syriac sources are also very fragmentary. The Vatican Syriac Ms. 155 (Codex Syr. noster XVI of Assemani) contains a biographical notice on Philoxenus by an unknown author. This is the document from which Assemani took the four extracts he gives in his sketch of Philoxenus' life (*B. O.*, II, pp. 10, 13, 17, 20) [6]. We publish it *in extenso* in Appendix I, and shall refer to it as the *Anonymous Notice*. It does not add much to what we already know. Scattered bits of information about Philoxenus are found here and there in Syriac authors, especially in the Letter of Simon of Beth-Arscham concerning Barsauma, bishop of Nisibis [7], in the Edessene Chronicle [8], in the so-called Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite [9], in the writings of Jacob of Edessa [10], and in the Ecclesiastical History of Bar-Hebraeus [11]. The published writings of Philoxenus and the three letters which, for the first time, are given in this dissertation, supply us with a few important data, and it is probable that much valuable information might be gathered from his other works, but, unfortunately, they still remain unedited.

---

(1) Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (*P. L.*), vol. 68, p. 949.
(2) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86 bis, pp. 2657 sqq.
(3) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, pp. 325 sqq.
(4) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 121, pp. 676 sqq.
(5) Cf. Krüger, *Monophysitische Streitigkeiten im Zusammenhange mit der Reichspolitik*, p. 4.
(6) Assemani quotes those extracts from Codex Syr. nost. XIII. This is evidently an error (cf. *B. O.*, I, 614).
(7) *Bibliotheca Orientalis clementino-vaticana* (*B. O.*), I, pp. 346-358.
(8) *B. O.*, I, pp. 387-429.
(9) Ed. W. Wright, Cambridge, 1882. The name of the author of this Chronicle is unknown (cf. Duval, *La Littérature Syriaque*, 2d. ed., p. 188).
(10) *B. O.*, I, p. 475.
(11) Ed. Abbeloos and Lamy, vol. I, pp. 183, 195.

It is not within the scope of the present chapter to discuss all the different sources which have been enumerated; but it is sufficient to show that the information which we obtain from Syriac documents and from the writings of Philoxenus himself, sometimes confirms or supplements, and sometimes corrects or contradicts the testimony derived from non-Syriac sources.

Early Life of Philoxenus.

2. We are entirely ignorant of the year of the birth of Philoxenus; but as he studied at Edessa in the time of Ibas (1), bishop of that city from 435 to 457 (2), and was still living in 522 (3), it is safe to assume that he was born in the second quarter of the fifth century.

Theodore the Reader, Evagrius, and after them, Theophanes and Cedrenus, inform us that Philoxenus was of Persian origin (4). Their testimony is confirmed by Simon of Beth-Arscham and by the writer of the anonymous notice. They give the additional information that Philoxenus was born at Tahal, a village in the province of Bēth-Garmai (5). The anonymous notice says: « Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbôgh, wise in God and illustrious by his science, is the same as Mār Aksenāyā who is famous for his writings. He was born in the village of Tahal, in the country of the Persians » (6). Nothing is known of his

(1) *B. O.*, I, p. 352.

(2) Duval, *Histoire politique, religieuse et littéraire d'Edesse jusqu'à la première croisade*, p. 168.

(3) Philoxenus wrote his Letter to the Monks of Senun in 522. Cf. *B. O.*, II, p. 20.

(4) Although Philoxenus was born a subject of Persia, he may not have been of Persian blood. The Syrian Christians living in the colonies of the Persian empire were generally called Persians.

(5) The country between the Tigris and the mountains of Kurdistan, south of the Lesser Zab and north of the Didjala (cf. Duval, *Lit. Syr.*, Map.).

(6) See Appendix I.

parents; he had a brother named Addai who studied with him at Edessa (1).

In a fragment of Theodore the Reader (2), it is related that some bishops from Persia visited Philoxenus after he had been appointed to the see of Mabbôgh, and recognized in him a slave who had run away from his master and had never been baptized. This they told to Peter the Fuller who had consecrated him bishop; but Peter, caring little what ought to be done, replied that the episcopal consecration was sufficient to take the place of baptism. This accusation is also made by Theophanes (3) and Cedrenus (4), and, in modern times, is repeated by the judicious Tillemont (5) and the learned Le Quien (6).

We have no means of determining whether Philoxenus was born a slave or a free man; but there is abundant proof that he was baptized. The testimony of Theophanes and Cedrenus, and the opinion of Tillemont and Le Quien, need not be considered here, for they evidently rest on the authority of Theodore. Now Theodore gives his information on mere hearsay, and does not confirm it by any written or public document. He says: « Concerning him (Philoxenus), I shall relate in part many things which I learned from different men through diligent inquiry » (7). Evagrius does not say that Philoxenus was unbaptized, and his silence is very eloquent here, for he had received his information concerning Philoxenus from old men who had seen with their own eyes, and remembered well everything that happened in Antioch in the days of Flavian, with whom Philoxenus

---

(1) *B. O.*, I, 353.

(2) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86, p. 216.

(3) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 328.

(4) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 121, p. 676.

(5) Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, vol. XVI, p. 677.

(6) Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. II. p. 928.

(7) « *Περὶ τούτου, ἃ πολλὰ παρὰ διαφόρων ἠκρίβωσα, ἀπὸ μέρους λέξω* ». Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86, p. 216.

was continually at war (1). Again, the monks of Palestine, in their famous letter to Alcison, bishop of Nicopolis in Illyria, accuse Philoxenus of various crimes, but they make no allusion to the question of his baptism (2).

But, besides this negative evidence, it can be shown from Philoxenus' own writings that he had received the sacrament of baptism. In his Letter to Zeno, he says: « I was baptized, therefore, in the name of Him Who died, and I confess that He in Whose name I was baptized, died for me, and I believe that I have put on in baptism Him in Whose name and in Whose death I was baptized, according to the words of Paul. For I have put on spiritually in the waters (of baptism) the Spiritual Being Who became corporal, and I confess that He Who, living, experienced death in the flesh, is He Who raises (the dead) and gives life » (3). And again, in the same letter, he writes: « In saying anathema to these doctrines (of Nestorius and Eutyches), I act according to the Holy Books, and adhere to the tradition of the Fathers from whom I have received the true and apostolic faith, that faith by which I have been found worthy, with all the baptized, of life, of freedom, and of adoption » (4). We have no reason then to doubt the fact of Philoxenus' baptism. Assemani is probably right when he says that the assertion of Theodore the Reader is a calumny invented by the orthodox, « ab orthodoxis in odium flagitiosissimi hominis adjectum fuisse » (5); and, as this last sentence shows, Assemani cannot be suspected of partiality towards Philoxenus.

---

(1) *« Κατειλήφαμεν γὰρ ἐνίους ἐσχατογέροντας, τοὺς, ὅσα συμβεβηκεν ἐπὶ Φλαβιανοῦ τῇ μνήμῃ διασώζοντας »*. Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86-bis, p. 2665.

(2) Migne, ibid., p. 2657.

(3) P. 125.

(4) P. 126.

(5) *B. O.*, II, p. 12.

Philoxenus at Edessa.

3. At a comparatively early age Philoxenus, accompanied by his brother Addai (1), came to the Persian school of Edessa which was then, and had been from the time of its foundation in 363, the most prominent center of intellectual and literary activity among the Syrians (2). St. Ephrem taught ten years there (363-373) (3), and in its halls were trained some of the greatest masters of Syriac literature (4). As may be inferred from the many Syriac translations from the Greek which have come down to us, the writings of the Greek Fathers (5) and the teachings of Aristotle (6) were held in high esteem by that famous school, and the influence of both on Philoxenus is plainly noticeable (7).

---

(1) *B. O.*, I, p. 353.
(2) Cf. Duval, *Histoire d'Edesse*, p. 145.
(3) Duval, *Littérature Syriaque*, p. 334.
(4) Isaac of Antioch, Narses, and others.
(5) Duval, *Littérature Syriaque*, p. 308.
(6) Duval, ibid., p. 254.
(7) The influence of Aristotelian philosophy among the Syrians dates from the beginning of the fifth century, when the spread of Nestorian doctrines had made a knowledge of Greek absolutely necessary. According to Ebed-Jesu, three professors of the Persian school of Edessa, Ibas, Koumi, and Probus, translated into Syriac the works of the Interpreter (Theodore of Mopsuestia) and the writings of Aristotle (*B. O.*, III, *pars* I, p. 85). It is not believed that all the works of Aristotle were translated by them. Probus translated and commented the *Περὶ ἑρμηνείας* (Duval, *Lit. Syr.*, p. 254). He also wrote a treatise on the *Prior Analytics* (edited and translated by A. Van Hoonacker, *Journal Asiatique*, 9th series, t. XVI, pp. 70-166). After the destruction of the Persian school of Edessa by order of Zeno in 489, the study of the philosophy of Aristotle was cultivated by both the Jacobites and the Nestorians. Among the Jacobites, we may notice Sergius of Rēš'ainā († 536), Severus Sebokht (VII c.), Jacob of Edessa († 708), and George, bishop of the Arabs († 724); among the Nestorians, Ḥenānišo' I († 701), Mār-Abbā II († 751), and especially the numerous scholars and physicians who lived at the court of the Abbassides in Baghdad during the ninth and tenth centuries. The Nestorians initiated the Arabs

It is there that he became acquainted with the patristic lore of the age, and especially with the works of Cyril of Alexandria for whom he always professed the greatest admiration. His knowledge of the Fathers must have been considerable, for in his treatise « How One Person of the Holy Trinity became incarnate and suffered for us », he quotes passages not only from SS. Ephrem and Cyril, but also from St. John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Emesa, Alexander and Theophilus of Alexandria, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzen and Atticus of Constantinople (1). It is partly from the works of those great masters that Philoxenus derived the wealth of theological terms and expressions for which his writings are remarkable. These terms and expressions do not imply a servile imitation of Greek literature, for his style and vocabulary are distinctly Syriac (2); they rather account for his deep knowledge of the principal religious works of the times, and his wonderful power and skill as a controversialist.

Philoxenus was influenced also by the philosophy of Aristotle. As the examination of his doctrines will show, his theological opinions reflect the tendencies of the school of Antioch, in which the teachings of the Stagyrite held sway, no less than those of the school of Alexandria which recognized Plato as its master. This is particularly true of his views on the Incarnation. Like the Alexandrian Monophysites, he admits only one nature in Christ after the union and dwells on the mysterious union of the two natures and on the necessity of faith in all

---

to the philosophy of Aristotle, and translated it for them from Syriac into Arabic. The Arabs proved very apt pupils. Indeed, they soon surpassed their teachers themselves, and, after having made Aristotelian philosophy their own, they introduced it to the scholars of the middle ages. Cf. Duval, *Lit. Syr.*, pp. 253-263.

(1) Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac Mss. in the British Museum*, part II, p. 528.

(2) I have noted the few Greek words occurring in the three letters.

questions relating to the Incarnation of the Son of God; but, with the followers of the school of Antioch, he insists on the reality of Christ's humanity and its consubstantiality with ours, rejects the Gnostic and Eutychian theories on the origin of the body of the Lord, and teaches explicitly that Christ suffered in the flesh, that is, only in so far as He became man. Indeed, he hurled anathemas against Eutyches as freely as he did against the Nestorians and against the Catholics who received the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon.

But the school of Edessa was more than a home of science and literature; it had become the center of the religious polemics of the times. Naturally enough, it could not remain indifferent to the great christological questions which occupied the minds of both the clergy and the people, and which were discussed with as much ardor in the imperial palace at Constantinople as in churches and monasteries. Nestorian opinions were being spread broadcast and found their way into this famous school. St. Rabbula, who was bishop of Edessa from 412 to 435 (1), after having, according to some, looked with favor upon the new doctrines (2), fought with energy against them as soon as he understood that they were subversive of Catholic faith. He was one of the strongest supporters of Cyril of Alexandria at the Council of Ephesus (431) (3), and he translated into Syriac (4) Cyril's *De recta fide in Dominum Nostrum J. C.*, which he distributed on all sides in the hope of checking the progress of error. But the seeds of the new heresy had taken deep root. Rabbula's successor, Ibas (435-457), was openly favorable to Nestorius. In collaboration with Koumi, Probus, and Mane, all disciples of the Persian school, he had, in his youth, translated

(1) Duval, *Histoire d'Edesse*, p. 168.
(2) Duval, ibid., p. 171.
(3) Duval, *Histoire d'Edesse*, p. 172.
(4) Duval, *Littérature Syriaque*, p. 342.

the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Diodorus of Tarsus (1); and when Philoxenus came to Edessa, the great school had become a hotbed of Nestorianism and remained such up to the time of its destruction by order of Emperor Zeno in 489 (2).

However, not all the students shared the opinions of Ibas. Among those who disagreed with him, Simon of Beth-Arscham mentions Philoxenus of Mabbôg, and his testimony is well borne out by Philoxenus' subsequent career, for, during more than sixty years, he waged an incessant war against the doctrines of Nestorius. Under the name of Nestorians he also included Catholics and all those who maintained two natures in Christ; for, confounding the notions of nature and person, he did not admit a middle course between the Nestorian heresy and the Catholic doctrine. This explains why, in the same breath, he anathematizes not only Nestorius and Ibas, but also Pope Leo I, Leo's dogmatic epistle to Flavian of Constantinople, and the definition of the Council of Chalcedon (3). He refers to Catholics as the Nestorian heretics (4), for not admitting two persons as well as two natures in Christ.

His Struggle with Calandion.

4. But Philoxenus, as he tells us in his Letter to the Monks (5), did not keep his faith to himself. It is probable that,

(1) Duval, *Hist. d'Edesse*, p. 174.

(2) Cf. the first letter of Jacob of Serugh to the Monks of Mar-Bassus, published by Abbé Martin in the *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 30, p. 221: « Now there was in the city (Edessa) a school of Persians, which adhered very strongly to the doctrine of the foolish Diodorus. That school has corrupted the whole East, although it has since been destroyed by the care of the Blessed Mar Cyrus, of holy memory, bishop of Edessa, and by order of the faithful Emperor Zeno ».

(3) Cf. his confession of faith against the Council of Chalcedon, in Budge, *The Discourses of Philoxenus*, vol. II, p. xcviii.

(4) *B. O.*, II, p. 15.

(5) P. 94.

after his departure from the Persian school, he travelled through Northern Mesopotamia and the Osrhoene province, spreading his Monophysite doctrines and enlisting the sympathy and help of those who agreed with him. The fact that he wrote letters to the Monks of Amid (1), of Arzūn (2), and of Senūn (3), would confirm this view, and such is also the inference which may be drawn from his first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal, one of the many monasteries in the neighborhood of Amid (4). This important letter, as will be shown later on, was written in the year 485. It proves beyond all doubt that Philoxenus was well known by the monks there. The tone of the letter, the nature of its contents, the praises which he bestows upon their labors on behalf of truth, and the bitterness with which he speaks of his enemies, show not only that the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal agreed with him on matters of doctrine, but that he had in them willing and powerful allies ready to help his cause and to further his plans. However the labors of Philoxenus were not confined to the territory around Edessa and Amid. He must have come west of the Euphrates into Syria Prima before the year 485; for, according to Theodore the Reader, Evagrius, Theophanes, and Cedrenus, he was expelled from Antioch by the patriarch Calandion

---

(1) The modern Diarbekir. An extract from the letter to the Monks of Amid is extant in Syr. Ms. Add. 17193 of the B. M., (Wright DCCCLXI), fol. 69b. Another fragment is found in Syr. Ms. 126 of the Vatican (Cod. Syr. nost. VI). Cf. *B. O.*, II, p. 37.

(2) A little east of Amid. A fragment of the letter to the Monks of Arzūn is found in Syr. Ms. 135 of the Vatican (Cod. Syr. nost. XI), fol. 89. Cf. *B. O.*, II, p. 45.

(3) The letter to the Monks of Senūn was not written till the year 522 (*B. O.*, II, p. 20), but Philoxenus' acquaintance with these monks must go back to a much earlier date. The letter is extant in Syr. Ms. 136 of the Vatican, fol. 58v-end of Ms., and in Syr Ms. Add. 14597 of the B. M. (Wright DCCXXX), fol. 35b-91a. The monastery of Senūn was situated near Edessa (*B. O.*, II, p. 38).

(4) Cf. Sozomen in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 67, p. 1077.

(482-485), for corrupting the doctrines of the Church and disturbing the villages near the great city (1).

We have here a manifest allusion to his proselytizing work on behalf of Monophysitism and to the crusade he had already undertaken against the Nestorians and against the adherents of the Council of Chalcedon. The times were indeed favorable to his schemes. Zeno and Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, were at war with the Holy See. The famous Henoticon of 482, which was to restore unity to the divided churches, had become a decree of discord (2). It offended the Catholics, because it spoke in equivocal terms of the faith of the Fathers of Chalcedon; and it did not satisfy the extreme Eutychians, because it did not condemn explicitly the doctrine of the two natures. The proud Acacius acted as if the pretensions of the 28th canon of Chalcedon, which made Constantinople the second see of the catholic world (3), had been recognized by Rome. He persuaded Zeno to depose John Talaia from the see of Alexandria and to appoint Peter Mongus in his stead (4). Contrary to the discipline of the Church, he appointed the heretic bishop, John Codonatus, to the diocese of Tyre, thereby usurping the rights of the patriarch of Antioch (5). Moreover, he endeavored to induce all the bishops of the East to sign the Henoticon and to communicate with Mongus (6). Deaf to the remonstrances of the Holy See, he was excommunicated by Felix III (7), and his excommunication marked the beginning of the Eastern schism (484-519) during which Constantinople was cut off from the communion of Rome.

---

(1) Locis citatis.
(2) Cf. MARIN, *Les Moines de Constantinople*, p. 270.
(3) On this canon of the Council of Chalcedon cf. HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. II, p. 527.
(4) TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, vol. XVI, p. 330.
(5) TILLEMONT, ibid., p. 335.
(6) THEOPHANES in MIGNE, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 324.
(7) HEFELE, op. cit., vol. II, p. 607 sqq.

... enemies.

... agreed with him ... willing and ... to further his plans. ... were not confined to the ter... He must have come west of ... Prima before the year 485; for, ac... Reader, Evagrius, Theophanes, and Ce... from Antioch by the patriarch Calandion

---

...kir. An extract from the letter to the Monks ... Add. 17193 of the B. M. (Wright DCCCLXI), ... is found in Syr. Ms. 126 of the Vatican (Cod. ... II, p. 37.

... of Amid. A fragment of the letter to the Monks of ... Syr. Ms. 135 of the Vatican (Cod. Syr. nost. XI), fol. 89.

... the Monks of Senun was not written till the year 522 ... Philoxenus' acquaintance with these monks ... earlier date. The letter is extant in Syr. M... of Ms., and in Syr. Ms. Add. 14... XXX., fol. 35b-91a. The monastery of ... II. p. 38... in Ms...

[illegible]

Church, he appointed [illegible] to the diocese of Tyre [illegible] the rights of the patriarch of Antioch (1). However, he endeavoured [illegible] the bishops of the East to sign the Henoticon and to communicate with Mongus (2). [illegible] excommunicated by [illegible] marked the beginning of the [illegible] Constantinople [illegible]

[illegible]

Such a deplorable condition of affairs helped Philoxenus' designs. Besides, he had grievances of his own against Calandion. This holy patriarch was a zealous defender of the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon; he persistently refused to sign the Henoticon of Zeno (1); he would not separate himself from the communion of Rome nor acknowledge the usurper Mongus as the lawful patriarch of Alexandria (2); he had inserted the words « Christ King » into the Trisagion of Peter the Fuller, so as to refer the crucifixion explicitly to Christ alone (3); in a word, Calandion was then one of the standard bearers of the Catholic faith in Syria, and a staunch opponent of Monophysitism. Philoxenus, who had already espoused the cause of the Monophysites, became his bitter enemy. Nor was he alone in the struggle. It is indeed very probable that he was assisted by the monks of Teleda (4), and of Mār Bassus (5), two famous monasteries in the neighborhood of Antioch. We know from his letters to the Monks of Teleda and of Senūn, that he had been in the monasteries of Mar Bassus and of Teleda, where the monks shared his opinions. It is possible that he was making an active propaganda among them. At any rate, Calandion, discerning in him an enemy of the faith and a disturber of the peace of the Church, expelled him from his diocese (6). But this triumph was not of long duration; for, under pretext of having favored Leontius in his revolt against Zeno, but in reality for refusing to sign the Henoticon (7) and to communicate with Mongus (8), Calandion

(1) Cf. Theophanes in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 325.
(2) Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. XVI, p. 366.
(3) Tillemont, ibid., p. 319.
(4) The modern Telladi about half way between Antioch and Aleppo. Cf. Guidi, *La Lettera di Filosseno ai monaci di Tell'Addâ*. p. iii.
(5) Near Apamea. See Duval, *Lit. Syr.*, Map.
(6) Theodore the Reader, in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86, p. 216.
(7) Theophanes in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 325.
(8) Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. XVI, p. 366.

was banished to Egypt and the see of Antioch passed for the third time into the hands of Peter the Fuller (1).

After this, it would be natural to suppose that Philoxenus was connected in some way with the deposition of Calandion. His first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal seems to warrant this supposition. He says: « And the same friend of Christ (the Emperor) has openly declared that he gained the victory over his enemies with (the help of) your prayers, and he is ready to give us ample reward for the work which we have undertaken for the peace of the churches, and to drive away from them the enemies of the Cross » (2).

His Appointment to Mabbôg.

5. The nature of the reward to which Philoxenus alludes here can only be a matter of conjecture. It is worthy of notice, however, that in the year 485, shortly after the exile of Calandion and the intrusion of Peter the Fuller into the see of Antioch, Philoxenus was, by the latter, consecrated bishop and appointed to the diocese of Hierapolis or Mabbôgh (3) in the

(1) Cf. Baronius, *Annales*, anno 485, t. VIII, p. 460.

(2) P. 115.

(3) The modern Manbidj, northeast of Antioch and almost due south of Carchemish. Hierapolis was a metropolitan see and, according to Le Quien (*Oriens Christianus*, vol. II, pp. 926-952), had jurisdiction over the following thirteen dioceses or churches: Cyrrhus (Huru Peigamber), Samosata (Samsat), Doliche (Dulluk), Germanicia (Maraš), Zeugma (Biredjik), Europus (Djerabis), Barbalissus (Kalaat Balis ?), Perrha, Urima, Sura, Neocesarea, Sergiopolis and Marianopolis. See Kiepert's Maps (*Provinces Asiatiques de l'Empire Ottoman*), and his map of Prof. Haussknecht's *Reisen im Orient*, 1865-1869, I-II. For a history and description of Hierapolis, see Ritter's *Erdkunde im Verhältniss zur Natur and zur Geschichte des Menschen*, 2d ed., vol. 10 (*West-Asien*, Band IV), pp. 1041-1061. Cf. also Pococke, *A description of the East*, London (1745), vol. II, part I, p. 166 sqq., and the *Archives des Missions scientifiques et littéraires*, Paris (1866), 2e série, t. III, p. 347 sqq.

patriarchate of Antioch. It was on this occasion that his name was changed from Aksenāyā to Philoxenus (1).

The anonymous notice (2) places Philoxenus' consecration in the year 800 of the Greeks (A. D. 488), but this is certainly an error. Church historians (3) agree in saying that Philoxenus came to Mabbôgh in 485, and their testimony is confirmed by a passage in Philoxenus' Letter to the Monks of Senūn written in the year 522 from Philippopolis in Thrace, where he had been exiled by Justin. Speaking of Alexander, his successor in the see of Mabbôgh, he says: « The clergy and the monks of our city have been ordered by him who rules over them to accept his (Alexander's) faith. As to our faith, which is that of Peter and of the Apostles, and which during thirty-four years I have preached to them in all ecclesiastical assemblies, they are commanded by him to look upon it as the heresy of the Manicheans » (4). From the Edessene Chronicle (5) we know that Philoxenus was exiled in the second year of Justin (519). If we subtract thirty-four from this latter date, we get 485 as the year of his appointment to Mabbôgh. It was probably in the same year that he accepted the Henoticon which, under the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius, had to be signed by all the bishops of the East under penalty of exile (6), and which was then, as Tillemont remarks, the only door to the episcopate (7).

Very little is known concerning the next thirteen years of Philoxenus' life. There is no doubt that he continued his opposition to the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches and propagated his religious views in his vast province. It is also pos-

(1) Theophanes in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 328.

(2) See *Appendix* I.

(3) Baronius, anno 485, *Annales*, vol. VIII, p. 456.

(4) *B. O.*, II, p. 12.

(5) *B. O.*, I, p. 408. Cf. Hallier, *Untersuch. ü. d. Edess. Chr.* 125.

(6) Gibbon, *The history of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. Milman (1840), vol. VI, p. 29.

(7) *Mémoires*, vol. XVI, p. 664.

sible, as Budge observes, that during this time « he wrote parts or all of many of the works which have made his name so famous among Monophysite writers » (1). The Letter to Zeno was written probably in 485 when he signed the Henoticon. The Discourses on Christian life and character were composed, according to Budge (2), between 485 and 500. We may also place within the same period the beginning of his translation of the Bible which was published at Mabbôgh in 508 (3). His discourses show that in the midst of turmoil and strife he found time for meditation and study; they contain no allusion whatever to the disputes and controversies in which he was engaged for the greater part of his life.

According to the so-called Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite (4), Philoxenus was in Edessa in May 498. The Saturnalia were being celebrated there for the second time. During seven days the citizens gave themselves up to all kinds of games and pleasures with the consequence that prayer and divine service were neglected. The pious author of the Chronicle remarks that Philoxenus preached only one day against the scandal, though he especially should have taken upon himself the duty of instructing the people.

His Struggle with Flavian.

6. In the year 498 Palladius, the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, died and was succeeded by Flavian II. The latter passed for being an opponent of the Council of Chalcedon (5), and this is probably the reason why he was appointed by Ana-

---

(1) *The Discourses of Philoxenus*, vol. II, p. xxi.

(2) Ibid., p. LXXIII.

(3) Budge, ibid., p. xxix.

(4) *Edition Wright*, p. 25.

(5) « *Φασὶ δὲ Φλαβιανὸν τοῖς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι δόγμασιν ἀντικεῖσθαι* ». Theophanes in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 341.

stasius to that important see. After his accession, however, he declared himself in favor of the Council, renounced the communion of the patriarch of Alexandria (1), and united himself with Macedonius of Constantinople and with Elias of Jerusalem. This change of policy drew upon him the opposition of Philoxenus, and thus began between the two a struggle which, with some interruptions, lasted for nearly fourteen years (499-513).

It was probably in the interest of his party and to protest to Anastasius against Flavian's appointment that Philoxenus went twice to Constantinople, as we learn from his Letter to the Monks of Senūn, in which he complains of the persecutions he suffered at the hands of his enemies: « What I have suffered from Flavian and Macedonius, who were archbishops of Antioch and of the capital, and before them from Calandion, is known and spoken of everywhere. I keep silence concerning what was plotted against me in the time of the Persian war among the nobles by the care of him who is called Flavian the heretic, and what happened to me in Edessa, and in the country of the Apameans, and in that of the Antiochians when I was in the monastery of the blessed Mār Bassus, and also in Antioch; and again, when I went up to the capital on two occasions, the like things were done unto me by the Nestorian heretics (2) ».

The first of these visits to the capital is believed to have taken place in 499 (3). Victor Tununensis relates that a council was held at Constantinople in that year under the presidency of Flavian and Philoxenus. At the demand of Anastasius, the council anathematized Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, Ibas of Edessa, Andrew of Samosata, Eleutherius of Tyana, Cyrus of Hierapolis, John of Cyrrhus, and all those who admitted two natures in Christ and did not con-

(1) Cf. Liberatus, Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 68, p. 1030.
(2) *B. O.*, II, p. 15.
(3) Duval, *Lit. Syr.*, p. 357; *B. O.*, II, p. 15.

fess that one of the Trinity was crucified, also Leo of Rome and his dogmatic epistle, and the Council of Chalcedon [1]. It is probable that Victor anticipates here the course of events, and places in the year 499 what, according to Theophanes and Evagrius, took place later on. It is hardly reasonable to suppose that a council could be held from which Macedonius, the patriarch of Constantinople (496-511), would have been excluded; still less, that Flavian would have consented to preside over a council in company with his enemy. Doubtless Victor refers here to another council [2] which was held at Constantinople in 498, to bring about a reconciliation between some monasteries of the city and the principal church from which they had separated themselves on account of Acacius and of the Henoticon.

Whatever may have happened during Philoxenus' first visit to the capital, it is certain that his differences with Flavian were not settled. The Persian war (502-505), which caused untold misery and destruction in Syria and Mesopotamia, and in Philoxenus' own province, interrupted for a while the struggle between them. But it was renewed in 507 [3] with more bitterness than ever. From the passage quoted above it would appear that Flavian had sought to influence the nobles, probably the Roman officials of the country, against Philoxenus. Certain it is that the latter began to accuse Flavian of Nestorianism. After Flavian had anathematized Nestorius and his doctrine, Philoxenus insisted that he should also anathematize Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, Ibas of Edessa, Cyrus of Hierapolis, Eleutherius of Tyana, and John of Cyrrhus, and told him that he would continue to regard him as a Nestorian, unless he condemned all these men together with their

---

(1) MIGNE, *P. L.*, vol 68, p. 949.

(2) THEOPHANES in MIGNE, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 340. Cf. also ASSEMANI, *B. O.*, II, p. 15.

(3) Cf. TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, vol. XVI, p. 677.

doctrines [1]. To bring greater pressure to bear upon him, Philoxenus enlisted the help of the Acephali of Egypt, and of Eleusius of Sasima and Nicias of Laodicea, all of whom shared his opposition to Flavian [2]. Coming again to Constantinople, Philoxenus sought the help of the Emperor with the result that in 509 Anastasius tried to force Flavian to sign the Henoticon a second time [3] and to condemn all the bishops whom Philoxenus had mentioned. Flavian convoked a provincial synod, and sent to the Emperor a letter in which, for the sake of peace, he confirmed the first three Councils and anathematized the persons named by Philoxenus, but did not speak of the Council of Chalcedon. With this procedure, however, Philoxenus was not satisfied, and he demanded that Flavian and Elias of Jerusalem, Flavian's friend, should condemn the Council of Chalcedon and all those who admitted two natures in Christ [4]. He then joined hands with Soterichus of Cappadocia and appealed again to Anastasius, who gave orders for a council to meet at Sidon, 511-512 [5]. Flavian and Elias were both present, and Philoxenus and Soterichus presided. We do not know exactly what took place there [6]. Through the efforts of Flavian and Elias the Council of Chalcedon was not anathematized, and the council of Sidon was dismissed without anything being done against them. Thereupon, Philoxenus wrote to the Emperor accusing the two bishops of having acted hypocritically [7]. Seeing that his efforts to dispossess Flavian of the see of Antioch had failed, he bribed the monks of Cynegica and those of Syria Prima to rush into the city and to make Flavian anathematize the Council of Chalcedon [8].

---

(1) EVAGRIUS in MIGNE, *P. G.*, vol. 86 bis, p. 2661.
(2) EVAGRIUS, ibid.
(3) TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, vol. XVI, p. 679.
(4) TILLEMONT. ibid., p. 681.
(5) HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. II, p. 666.
(6) TILLEMONT, ibid., p. 703.
(7) THEOPHANES in MIGNE, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 361.
(8) EVAGRIUS in MIGNE, *P. G.*, vol. 86 bis, p. 2665.

But the inhabitants, who were devoted to Flavian, rose up in arms against the monks, slew many of them, and cast their bodies into the Orontes. In a moment of weakness, and perhaps to avoid further bloodshed, Flavian pronounced anathema against the Council of Chalcedon, and the four bishops, Diodorus, Theodore, Ibas, and Theodoret (1). But Philoxenus accused him again of insincerity, and Flavian was banished to Petra in Palestine (Palaestina III^{a}) (2), and the Monophysite monk Severus was appointed patriarch in his stead (3).

His Exile and Death.

7. Philoxenus did not long enjoy the fruits of victory. The Emperor Anastasius, his protector and friend, died in 518 and was succeeded by the orthodox Justin I. One of the first acts of the new ruler was to unite his efforts with those of Pope Hormisdas in bringing about a reconciliation between the East and the West. Communion with Rome was solemnly reestablished on Easter Sunday, March 24, 519 (4), and thus ended the schism which for thirty-five years had been a menace to the Church and to the Empire. The orthodox bishops who had been deposed under Zeno and Anastasius were restored to their sees, and the recalcitrant Monophysites sent into exile. Among the latter Theophanes mentions Philoxenus and his neighbor Peter of Apamea (5).

Philoxenus was first banished to Philippopolis in Thrace. It is from there that he wrote his Letter to the Monks of Senūn, and probably also his Letter to the Monks of Teleda,

(1) Theophanes, ibid.
(2) Evagrius, ibid.
(3) Evagrius, ibid., p. 2668.
(4) Hergenröther, *Histoire de l'Eglise, traduction Bélet*, vol. II, n.° 163, p. 274.
(5) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 384.

two of the most important of his dogmatic works. In both of them he condemns the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, and shows clearly that the sufferings and privations of his exile did not change the opinions for which he had been fighting since he left Edessa over half a century before. From Philippopolis he was brought to Gangra [1] in Paphlagonia, where he was murdered, probably in 523.

The anonymous notice [2] gives the following account of his death: « And when he (Philoxenus) had filled the Church with divine teachings and had interpreted the Books, and refuted the faith of the Nestorians by his writings against them, they cast him into exile in the city of Gangra and suffocated him with smoke. They shut him up in an upper chamber, and made smoke in the room below, and locked the doors. And thus he received the crown of martyrdom, being suffocated by them in the true confession ».

Various Judgments on Philoxenus.

8. Such was the death of Philoxenus. Very different judgments have been passed on this remarkable man. The Jacobites honor him as a martyr and saint. They celebrate his memory on the tenth of December, the eighteenth of February and the first of April [3], and, in the profession of faith exacted in the Jacobite Church from candidates to ordination, he is ranked among the holy Doctors and Fathers who preserved the faith of the first three Councils [4]. The historians of the Byzantine period re-

---

(1) *Barhebraei Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, ed. ABBELOOS and LAMY, vol. I, p. 197.

(2) See *Appendix* I. According to a note at the bottom of the page containing the anonymous notice, Philoxenus was put to death on account of his opposition to the Council of Chalcedon.

(3) *B. O.*, II, p. 20.

(4) DENZINGER, *Ritus Orientalium*, vol. II, p. 104.

gard him as the vilest of men, a slave of Satan (1), and a stranger to God (2). They accuse him of never having been baptized, and see in him a Manichean and the author of the heresy of the Iconoclasts. There is evidently a great deal of exaggeration on both sides and, as Budge remarks, « it is probable that we must make some allowance for the hostility of those to whose lot it has fallen to describe his life » (3).

It is certain that Philoxenus was baptized, if the evidence derived from his works is worth anything. His doctrine on the Incarnation does not bear out the charge of Manicheism; moreover, in some of his writings (4), he explicitly rejects the teachings of Mani and of Marcion. That he was an Iconoclast is not proved, and the passage adduced by Assemani (5) to confirm the testimony of Theophanes is far from conclusive. It is beyond question, however, that Philoxenus was always a bitter enemy not only of the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, but also of the definition of the Council of Chalcedon which he regarded as confirming the heresy of Nestorius. It is also certain that he resorted to violent means to deprive Flavian of the episcopal throne of Antioch. Yet he seems to have been sincere in his opposition. From the Letter of the Monks of Palestine to Alcison, bishop of Nicopolis, it would appear that, according to some, Philoxenus was moved to attack Flavian by what seemed to him the interests of the faith (6). In his Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal, Philoxenus thus rebukes his adversaries: « I fight for the common faith, and thou settest thyself against me with

---

(1) Cedrenus in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 121, p. 676.

(2) Evagrius in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86 bis, p. 2660.

(3) Op. cit., vol. II, p. xxiv.

(4) Budge, op. cit., vol. II. p. cxxxvi.

(5) *B. O.*, II, p. 21.

(6) Evagrius in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86 bis, p. 2660: « *Οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί σκοπῶν ἢ ποίαν ἔχθραν πρὸς Φλαβιανὸν ἐκδικῶν, προφάσει δὲ τῆς πίστεως, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ διηγοῦνται, κινεῖν μὲν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ διαβάλλειν ἄρχεται ὡς Νεστοριανόν* ».

the heretics. I toil and work day and night that the truth which was delivered to the Church may not be changed, and I direct the weapons of argument against those who deny the Cross, and thou insultest me (saying), « Hold thy tongue, let them do what they wish ». They want me to be silent lest I should expose their doctrines, and thou, with them, wantest me to remain silent. I hasten to root out division and to end the schism which they have caused in the faith, and thou declarest publicly that I am the cause of the division. They began a tumult, introduced a novelty, and disturbed the peace of all the churches, and thou considerest me as the author of the disturbance » (1). In his Letter to the Monks of Teleda, written during his exile, he says that he expects eternal life on account of the persecution to which he is being subjected: « If death should come to me on account of this truth, I believe that I shall receive life from it. And not only (the words) seducer and corruptor and other opprobrious names am I ready to hear for this doctrine, but I am also ready to suffer fire and beasts, and different kinds of torments, and persecutions without number » (2). And notwithstanding all this, he asks the prayers of the monks that his own enemies may be converted and see the truth: « Let us pray for them that they may repent, and may be found by the truth which seeks to find them; that their eyes may be opened so that they will see what they are doing and whom they persecute » (3).

But if historians and scholars differ in their judgment of the character of Philoxenus, they all agree in regarding him as one of the brightest stars of Syriac literature. Jacob of Edessa (4), whom the Syrians call *The Interpreter*, ranks him among the

---

(1) P. 117.

(2) Guidi, *La lettera di Filosseno ai monaci di Tell'Addâ*, fol. 29a, col. 1, lines 11-24.

(3) Guidi, ibid., col. 2, lines 12-18.

(4) *B. O.*, I, p., 475.

four great Syriac Doctors, putting him on an equal footing with St. Ephrem, Jacob of Serugh, and Isaac of Antioch. Bar-Hebraeus calls him « a most eloquent man and wonderful doctor who attacked mightily the party of the Dyophysites, and set forth healthy doctrines concerning the holy way of monastic life » (1).

The moderns are no less lavish in their praise and admiration. Assemani, who pronounces a very severe judgment on Philoxenus' character, calling him « a most corrupt man » (2), « a most pernicious heretic » (3), who would have devastated the Church of God like a wild boar (4), confesses that he wrote Syriac most elegantly: « Scripsit Syriace, si quis alius, elegantissime » (5). The late Prof. Wright of Cambridge, who won for himself universal fame as a Syriac scholar, says that Philoxenus was not only a man of strife and action, but an elegant writer as well (6). Prof. Guidi, of Rome, in his beautiful edition of the Letter of Philoxenus to the Monks of Teleda, also contributes his share of praise to the purity, eloquence and force of the style of Philoxenus: « Il suo valore letterario è incontrastato; ed in lui la squisita purità della lingua non è inferiore all'eloquenza ed alla forza dello stile » (7). And it is gratifying to add that the three letters, which are published in this volume, fully confirm the universal judgment of scholars as to the literary merits of Philoxenus, and give us, besides, a new proof of the dialectical skill and theological learning of that famous Monophysite.

---

(1) *Chronicon eccl.*, vol. I, p. 183.
(2) *B. O.*, II, p. 12.
(3) Ibid., p. 11.
(4) Ibid., p. 18.
(5) Ibid., p. 20.
(6) *Art. Syriac Literature* in Ency. Brit., 9th ed., p. 872.
(7) Op. cit., p. III.

CHAPTER II.

THE PUBLISHED WORKS OF PHILOXENUS.

Philoxenus was one of the most prolific writers of his age. When we think of the troubled condition of his life, and of the constant struggle that he waged against the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, and against the definition of the Council of Chalcedon, it is indeed marvelous that he should have found time to write so large a number of works. They are preserved mostly in the libraries of the British Museum, of Oxford, Rome, and Paris (1). They deal with a great variety of topics, and may be classified under four principal heads: Scripture, liturgy, asceticism and dogma. Outside of a hymn on the Nativity of Our Lord (the authenticity of which is doubtful for it has also been attributed to Severus of Antioch and to John bar Aphthon) (2), they are all written in prose, and, as ancients and moderns agree, they are among the best specimens of the golden age of Syriac literature. Unfortunately, the majority of them are still unpublished. Until the year 1873, in which Martin edited in his Syro-Chal-

(1) For a complete catalogue of the writings ascribed to Philoxenus, see Budge, op. cit., vol. II, pp. xlviii-lxvi. After Assemani (*B. O.*, II, p. 37), Budge (ibid., p. lviii, n°. xlv) speaks of two letters of Philoxenus to the Monks of Teleda. As Guidi remarks (*Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 35, p. 143), we know of one only. The supposed second letter to the Monks of Teleda, which is the first of the three letters published in this dissertation, is to be identified with the Letter to the Monks which Philoxenus inserted in his treatise showing that One of the Trinity was incarnate and suffered for us. This treatise is found in Syr. Ms. Add. 12164 of the British Museum (Wright's Catal., n°. DCLXXVI), and in Syr. Ms. 138 of the Vatican.

(2) *B. O.*, II, p. 46.

daicae Institutiones [1] the text of the Letter to Abu-Nafir, nothing was known of the writings of Philoxenus, except a Latin translation of two of his Anaphoras by Renaudot [2], and the brief extracts given of several of his works in the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Assemani [3]. We give here a review of all the published works of Philoxenus, as we had to make use of some of them in the exposition of his doctrines.

I.

The Discourses and other Texts.

9. The Discourses of Philoxenus on Christian life and character, the most important of his ascetical works, were published (Syriac text and English translation) in 1894 by Budge from Syriac Mss. of the sixth and seventh centuries in the British Museum [4].

The text is based on Add. 14598 (Wright DCCLXIV), which is called A. Variant readings are given from Add. 14595 (Wright DCLXXVIII), Add. 12163 (Wright DCLXXVII), Add. 17153 (Wright DCLXXIX), Add. 14596 (Wright DCLXXX), Add. 14625 (Wright DCLXXXI), Add. 14601 (Wright DCCXCV), and Add. 14621 (Wright DCCLXXIX). These seven Mss. are referred to as B, C, D, E, F, G, and H respectively. From the fact that the Scriptural quotations in the discourses are taken from the Peshitta, Budge concludes that these discourses were

---

(1) *Syro-Chaldaicae Institutiones*, pp. 71-78.

(2) *Liturgiarum Orientalium collectio*, vol. II, pp. 300, 309.

(3) *B. O.*, II, *Xenaias Mabugensis*, pp. 10-46.

(4) These discourses are found in 19 Mss. of the British Museum, either in whole or in part (BUDGE, op. cit., vol. II, pp. LII, XCIV). They are extant also in Syr. Ms. 201 (XIIIth century) of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* of Paris (See ZOTENBERG, *Catalogue des Manuscrits Syriaques et Sabéens de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, p. 149). Extracts of them in Karšūnī exist in Ms. 239 of the same library (ZOTENBERG, ibid., p. 194).

written before 508, the year in which Philoxenus published his translation of the Bible at Mabbôgh, and he places the time of their composition between 485 and the end of the fifth century (1).

These discourses are thirteen in number. The first is a prologue to the others; the second, third, and fourth treat of faith as a virtue; the fifth treats of simplicity; the sixth and seventh, of the fear of God; the eighth and ninth, of poverty; the tenth, of gluttony; the eleventh, of abstinence; and the twelfth and thirteenth, of fornication. They are written in exquisitely pure Syriac, and in them especially we notice those qualities of style for which Jacob of Edessa admired and praised the writings of Philoxenus (2).

Besides the above discourses, Budge has also published, in the second volume of his work, seven other short treatises of Philoxenus, which are very important from a dogmatic standpoint. Though less interesting than his larger dogmatic writings, they contain, in a few pages, the principles underlying his theological opinions, and make us partly acquainted with the objections which he urged against the Nestorians and against the adherents of the Council of Chalcedon. We give here a review of these different texts.

a) *An explanation* (3) *of the heresies of Mani, Marcion, and others,* from. Add. 14529 (7th or 8th century) (Wright DCCCLVI) of the British Museum, (fol. 65b-66b). The title is: ܬܘܒ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܪܝ، ܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܥܠ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܢ.

In this document, Philoxenus explains and rejects the heresies of the Gnostics, the Nestorians, and the Eutychians on the Incarnation, and gives us a short statement of his own doctrine.

(1) Budge, op. cit., vol. II, p. lxxiii.
(2) Duval, *Littérature Syriaque*, p. 230.
(3) Vol. II; Text, p. cxxxvi; Translation, p. xlv.

b) *A treatise against every Nestorian* (1), from the same Ms. (fol. 66b-68a). The title is: ܬܘܒ ܪ̈ܫܐ ܡܢ̈ܝܢܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܫܡܥܐ ܘܡܙܪܙܐ ܦܠܟܣܝܢܘܣ ܐܦܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܡܒܘܓ ܕܥܠܬܐ ܕܣܝ̈ܡܢ ܠܟܠ ܕܢܣܛܘܪܝܢܐ ܗܘ. ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܬܡܪ ܡܢܗ ܗܘܠܐܐ ܕܦܘܫܩܐ.

It contains seven chapters or paragraphs of which a summary is given (p. xxxvii). Philoxenus anathematizes Nestorius, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus, accepts the twelve chapters of Cyril of Alexandria against Nestorius, receives the Henoticon of Zeno, and pronounces anathema upon every one who would divide Christ into two natures.

c) *A confession of faith* (2) against the Council of Chalcedon. From the same Ms. (fol. 68a-69a). ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܦܪܫܬ ܡܢ ܟܢܘܫܬܐ. ܗܢܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܕܦܪܫܬ ܗܘܢܝܗ̇ ܕܟܠܩܝܕܘܢܐ.

In ten short paragraphs Philoxenus anathematizes the Council of Chalcedon for composing, as he says, a faith at variance with that of the Council of Nice, for excommunicating Nestorius while agreeing with him in doctrine, for distinguishing two natures in Christ and receiving Ibas of Edessa, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and Leo (the Great) of Rome.

d) *How one must reply when questioned as to his belief* (3). From the same Ms. (fol. 69b-71a). ܬܘܒ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܪܝ، ܐܟܣܢܝܐ: ܦܘܩ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܡܢܐ ܕܡܬܒܥܐ ܠ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܬܒܥܐ ܡܗܝܡܢ ܐܢܬ.

In this document, Philoxenus gives us a concise statement of his belief in the Blessed Trinity and in the Incarnation.

e) *Twelve chapters against those who maintain two natures in Christ and one person* (4). This treatise is found in

---

(1) Vol. II, Text, p. cxx.
(2) Ibid., Text, p. xcviii; Translation, p. xxxiii.
(3) Ibid., Text, p. xcvi; Translation, p. xxxi.
(4) Ibid., Text, p. civ.

Add. 14597 (A. D. 569) (Wright DCCXXX) of the British Museum, (fol. 91a-98b). The title is: ܬܘܒ ܪ̈ܫܐ ܕܡܪܝ܆ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܐܦܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܡܒܘܓ. ܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܢ ܒܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ.

Here Philoxenus argues that if we admit two natures in Christ, we must also admit two persons, and he does not distinguish between the Nestorian heresy and the Catholic doctrine.

f) *Twenty chapters against Nestorius* [1]. From the same Ms. (fol. 98b-105b). ܬܘܒ. ܡܩ̈ܠܐܐ ܥܣ̈ܪܝܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܒ: ܕܝܠܗ ܕܐܡܝ̈ܪܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ.

In this treatise Philoxenus formulates twenty objections against the doctrines of Nestorius. Most of these objections rest on the confusion of the notions of nature and person, his chief point being this, that since the Word became incarnate in His person, He also became incarnate in His nature, and since there is only one nature before the Incarnation, there can be but one after the Incarnation. Thus in the third chapter he says: « If God the Word became man in His person, and is not called two persons, but one person who became man, He also became man in His nature, and His nature who became man is one, and is not called two natures ».

g) *Ten chapters against those who divide Our Lord after the indivisible union* [2]. From the same Ms. (fol. 105b-107b). ܬܘܒ ܪ̈ܫܐ ܥܣ̈ܪܐ ܕܐܡܝ̈ܪܝܢ ܠܡܪܝ܆ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ: ܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܦܠܓܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܡܪܢ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܚܕܝܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܢܝܬܐ.

These ten chapters are directed against the Nestorians for admitting two persons in Christ, and against the followers of the Council of Chalcedon for acknowledging two natures after the union. Both, according to Philoxenus, divide Our Lord

---

(1) Ibid., Text, p. CXXIII; Summary, p. XXXIX.
(2) Ibid., Text, p. C; Summary, p. XXXVI.

by admitting two persons or two natures in Him. Here again he misunderstands the Catholic doctrine. Thus, in the third chapter, speaking of the adoration of the Magi, he says: « If two natures be admitted in Christ, which of the two did the Magi worship? If the divine nature, they could have done so when they were in their own country; if the human nature, they are worthy of blame, not of praise. Now the Book testifies concerning them that their action is worthy of praise. Therefore, when they worshipped Christ, they worshipped the Incarnate God » ([1]). In the premises of this argument, he evidently supposes that Catholics adore the natures separately.

II.

The Letter to Abu-Nafir.

10. The Syriac text of this letter was published in 1873 by Martin ([2]) from Add. 14529 of the British Museum (fol. 61a-65b). Fragments of it are also found in Add. 17193 (Wright DCCCLXI) (fol. 83a) ([3]), and Add. 17134 (Wright CCCCXXI) (fol. 4b) ([4]). The title is: ܣܘܢܗܕܝܩܘܢ ܕܟܬܒ ܡܪܝ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܡܒܘܓ : ܠܐܒܘ ܢܦܪ ܐܣܛܪܛܠܛܣ ܕܚܝܪܬܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܢܥܡܢ.

The synodical letter which Mār Aksenāyā, bishop of Mabbôgh, wrote to Abu-Nafir, stratelates ([5]) of Hira ([6]) of Beth-Naaman.

([1]) Ibid., p. c.
([2]) *Syro-Chaldaicae Institutiones*, pp. 71-78.
([3]) Wright, *Cat. Syr. Mss.*, p. 998.
([4]) Wright, ibid., p. 338.
([5]) The magister militum of the Romans (Cf. Du Cange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis*, vol. II, p. 1459).
([6]) A little south-east of Meshed ʿAlî, (Cf. Rothstein, *Die Dynastie der Laḫmiten in al-Ḥîra*, 12, f.). At an early date, the rulers of Hira became simple lieutenants of the Persian Kings.

Date. The list ([1]) of the rulers of Hira does not contain the name of Abu-Nafir. It mentions, however, Abu-Yafar who ruled from 498 to 503, simply as a vassal or lieutenant of the Persian King. If we assume his identity with Abu-Nafir, the date of composition of this letter would fall between 498 and 503. This document is very unlike the published writings of Philoxenus. The obvious differences of style and the glaring anachronisms which it contains regarding prominent events in the lives of Nestorius and of Theodore of Mopsuestia, raise serious doubts as to its authenticity ([2]). Philoxenus should have been well acquainted with the history of Nestorius and of Theodore, for he spent a few years in Edessa and in Antioch, cities which were for a time the strongholds of Nestorianism in the East. As no translation of this letter has been published, a detailed analysis of its contents will not be out of place here.

The letter gives: *a*) the genealogy of Nestorius and of Theodore; *b*) their elevation to the sees of Constantinople and of Mopsuestia; *c*) their heresy; *d*) the condemnation of Nestorius by the Council of Ephesus; *e*) the heresy of Eutyches and his condemnation at Chalcedon; *f*) the return of Timothy Aelurus to Alexandria; *g*) and the origin of the sect called Esaianists.

a) Addi married a woman named Amlaka who bore him two sons: Barbeelšemin and Abašoum. Barbeelšemin was the father of Nestorius, Abašoum of Theodore ([3]). Nestorius and

---

([1]) The kingdom of Hira was founded, it is related, about 195 by Mālik ben Fahm, but see Rothstein, op. c. 37 f.

([2]) These doubts are again increased by the strong probability that, at the time the letter is supposed to have been written, the kings of Hira were still heathens. Cf. the article of Guidi, *Mundhir III, und die beiden monophysitischen Bischöfe* in the *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 35, p. 142, where he shows that Mundhir III, who reigned in Hira from 505 to 513, was very probably a heathen.

([3]) This genealogy makes Nestorius and Theodore first cousins. There is no evidence of their having been related.

Theodore were born ([1]) at Maraš where the sons of Addi had settled. After they had mastered the Greek language, they were sent to Athens ([2]), where they studied philosophy.

b) In Athens, they became acquainted with some free men from Constantinople who praised them before Honorius, with the result that Honorius ([3]) commanded that they should both be made bishops, Nestorius, of Constantinople, and Theodore, of Mopšuestia.

c) Once in possession of their sees, they began to corrupt the true faith in private commentaries which they sent to each other ([4]), distinguishing the Only Son of God into two natures, attributing miracles to the one, and humiliations to the other.

d) Hearing of this, Theodosius the Younger convoked the Council of Ephesus against the Nestorian doctrines. Then Nestorius wrote to Theodore, and told him not to be afraid, but to go the Council ([5]), and to anathematize him (Nestorius), not indeed with the anathema which cuts one off from the kingdom of heaven, but only in the sense in which St. Paul desired to be anathema for the salvation of his brethren, the sons of Israel.

([1]) Theodore was born at Antioch, about 350 (Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 66, p. 11), and Nestorius was born in Germanicia (Maraš) (Smith, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, art. Nestorianism).

([2]) According to all accounts, they both studied at Antioch.

([3]) This is at variance with well established dates. Honorius ruled in the West from 395 to 423. The emperors of the East, during that period, were Arcadius (395-408), and Theodosius II (408-450). Nestorius was consecrated bishop of Constantinople, April 10, 428, five years after Honorius' death (Cf. Smith, loc. cit.), whilst Theodore became bishop of Mopsuestia at the end of the year 392 or the beginning of 393 (Cf. Goyau, *Chronologie de l'Empire Romain*, p. 610).

([4]) There is no evidence of any correspondence between Theodore and Nestorius, especially after the elevation of the latter to the see of Constantinople, for Theodore died in 428 (Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 66, p. 12). Nor is it certain that Nestorius was ever a disciple of Theodore at Antioch, as some have maintained. All we know is that Nestorius and his followers held the writings of Theodore in great esteem (Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. XII, p. 441).

([5]) Theodore died in 428, and the Council of Ephesus was held in 431.

e) In the days of Marcian, Eutyches rose against the Church, and taught that the Son of God brought His body down from heaven (1). And, because he would not recede from the position he had taken, he was excommunicated by the Council of Chalcedon. After the Fathers had assembled, Leo (2) wrote to them to receive the doctrines of Nestorius (3), and his own tomos (4). On threat of deposition made by Marcian, they yielded, because they loved their office. But Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, did not yield; he was exiled, and his secretary (5) became patriarch in his stead. The Alexandrians received the new patriarch; but some priests, deacons, and laymen who would not agree with the Council of Chalcedon, did not communicate with him; they fled into Ethiopia with Timothy (6), a disciple of Dioscorus.

f) After a while, the Alexandrians became sorry for having received the secretary of Dioscorus; they stoned him (7), and cast his body into the sea. After the death of Marcian, Timothy returned to Alexandria, took possession of the see, and forgave the Alexandrians. However, the priests, deacons, and laymen, who had returned with him, would not communicate with the Alexandrians, for they said: « Whoever has taken part in the Council of Chalcedon in any way, has not the priesthood ».

g) Then four priests from among them took the Gospel, placed it on the head of Esaias, and made him bishop. From

---

(1) In his Letter to the Monks (p. 97), Philoxenus accuses Eutyches of teaching that the body of Christ was made from nothing.

(2) Pope Leo the Great (440-461).

(3) As Monophysites did not distinguish between nature and person, they identified the followers of the Council of Chalcedon with the Nestorians.

(4) The dogmatic epistle to Flavian of Constantinople; Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 54, p. 755.

(5) Proterius. He was patriarch of Alexandria from 454 to 457.

(6) Timothy Aelurus.

(7) Proterius was not stoned by his own people, but was stabbed to death together with six of his priests in the baptistry of his cathedral on Good Friday 457 by the followers of Timothy himself. Cf. Neale, *The patriarchate of Alexandria*, vol. II, p. 12.

that time on they were called Esaianistae-Acephali (1). Concerning the belief of the Acephali, that those who had taken part in the Council of Chalcedon in any way had not the true priesthood, the letter goes on to explain that heretics confer baptism and priesthood validly, provided they have not preached their heresy openly. Consequently, the baptism and the orders conferred by the Fathers of Chalcedon after their dispersion were valid, because they did not preach their heresy (the definition of the two natures in Christ), so that the case of those who received those sacraments from them was parallel to the case of those who were baptized or ordained by Judas Iscariot. As his heresy was only in his heart, the sacraments which he conferred were valid.

III.

The Letter concerning Stephen Bar Sudaili.

11. This letter, addressed to Abraham and Orestes priests of Edessa, was published (Syriac text and English translation) by Frothingham in 1886, in his work *Stephen Bar Sudaili, the Syrian Mystic, and the book of Hierotheos*, Leyden (Brill). It is extant only in Syr. Ms. 107 of the Vatican (fol. 60r-63v), which is of the eighth century. The close of the letter is wanting. The title is: ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܡܪܝ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܡܒܘܓ ܠܘܬ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܘܐܘܪܣܛܝܣ ܩܫܝ̈ܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܗܝ : ܡܛܠ ܣܛܦܢܐ ܒܪ ܨܘܕܝܠܝ ܐܘܪܗܝܐ.

(1) The origin of the Acephali, and of the Esaianists, who were only a branch of that sect, does not date from the time of Timothy, but from the time of Peter Mongus, for the Acephali separated themselves from the latter, because he accepted the Henoticon, and would not anathematize the Council of Chalcedon. (Cf. Leontius Byz., *De Sectis*, Act. V, n.° 2, in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86, p. 1229). Their origin is posterior to 482, the year in which the Henoticon was promulgated. As to the origin of the Esaianists, some say that the hand of a certain bishop Eusebius, when dead, had been laid on the head of Esaias. Cf. Neale, ibid., p. 22.

Date. This letter was evidently written before the year 513, for Philoxenus refers to the impossibility of communicating, on account of differences in the faith, with the bishop of Jerusalem, Elias (494-513). Frothingham places the date of its composition between 509 and 512, when the contest between the Orthodox and Monophysite parties was at its height (¹).

Bar Sudaili was a Monophysite monk of Edessa, who had become imbued with pantheistic doctrines, probably in Egypt. From Jerusalem where he had retired, he had sent followers of his to Abraham and Orestes, priests of Edessa, with books containing his impious teachings. Hearing of this, Philoxenus wrote to these priests, warning them against Bar Sudaili's errors. According to Philoxenus, he taught that everything was consubstantial with God, that the good and the wicked would receive the same measure of retribution in the next world, that, on the day of the consummation, all things would return into the divinity from which they came. In his letter Philoxenus refutes at some length Bar Sudaili's pantheism and his doctrine on salvation.

IV.

The Letter to the Monks of Teleda.

12. The Syriac text of this letter, together with an introduction and an analysis of the contents, was published in 1886 by Guidi (²). His splendid edition corresponds page for page, column for column, and line for line, with the original which is extant only in Syr. Ms. 136 of the Vatican (fol. 3a-29a). Folios 1, 2, and 6, are wanting, hence the letter shows no title. A Syriac Ms. of the

(¹) *Stephen Bar Sudaili*, p. 58.

(²) *La lettera di Filosseno ai monaci di Tell ʿAddâ (Teleda)*, Memoria del Socio Ignazio Guidi. Reale Accademia dei Lincei (anno CCLXXXII, 1884-85), Roma, 1886.

British Museum, Add. 14663 (Wright DCCLI), contains four short extracts (1) of this letter with the following title: ܬܘܒ ܕܝܠܗ ܗܘ ܕܡܪܝ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ: ܡܢ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܫܕܪ ܠܕܝܪܝܐ ܕܬܠܥܕܐ.

The Ms. having been injured, the reading of the letter was a most difficult and laborious task. Guidi confesses that the decipherment of it cost him much patience and fatigue, and he certainly deserves the gratitude of all Syriac scholars for placing within their reach this letter of Philoxenus, which is one of the best specimens of the controversial literature of that period.

Date. From the last sentence of fol. 3 a, col. 2, Assemani (2) concludes that Philoxenus wrote this letter during his exile (519-523): « Pray also for me, not that I may be delivered from this persecution, but that I may derive profit from it, that it may become unto me a cause of eternal life ». In fol. 14b, col. 1, Philoxenus attacks especially one enemy, who, as Guidi remarks (3), may be Paul II, the successor of Severus on the episcopal throne of Antioch. On account of his zeal for the decrees of Chalcedon (he had placed the names of the six hundred and thirty Fathers of the Council in the diptychs) (4), Paul was accused of Nestorianism, and was called « the Jew » by the Monophysites (5). It is probably to him that Philoxenus refers in the following passage: « If any one calls thee by the name of Jew or heathen, thou art angry, and thou art not angry with thyself for voluntarily placing thy portion with them, and contending with us in their own words (6) ».

---

(1) Published by Guidi, ibid., p. vi.

(2) *B. O.*, II, p. 37.

(3) Op. cit., p. v, note 1.

(4) Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, vol. II, p. 732.

(5) Abbeloos and Lamy, *Barhebraei Chronicon*, vol. I, p. 195. Cf. also *the chronological Canon of James of Edessa*, edited by Brooks in the *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 53, p. 318.

(6) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 14*b*, col. 1, lines 14-21.

If the identity of Paul of Antioch with the adversary attacked by Philoxenus be granted, the letter would certainly be posterior to 519, the year in which Severus was exiled by Justin. And it may have been written before the year 521, in which Paul resigned the see of Antioch (1).

This letter was addressed to the Monks of Teleda, according to Guidi (2), the modern Telladi, about half way between Antioch and Aleppo. That these monks shared the opinions of Philoxenus, is evident from Philoxenus' own words: « Therefore, what that faith is for which it is necessary for us to die, in a few words we will show; not as teaching, but because we agree with your truth and your faith, and to show that we are one with you on the question of the divine Economy. And if we have been a seducer and corruptor, as the adversaries say, then so are you also with us. But if we have been sincere and orthodox, and this is the truth, it is a common victory and joy for the holy body of the Church » (3).

The letter to the Monks of Teleda is one of the most important of Philoxenus' works from the standpoint of doctrine and style. It is dogmatic in character and argumentative in form. As we shall have occasion to quote from it frequently when treating of Philoxenus' doctrine on the Incarnation and the Trinity, a brief analysis will suffice here.

After recommending himself to the prayers of the monks that he may derive profit from his sufferings, Philoxenus declares his belief in the Trinity and in the Incarnation of the Son of God. He shows afterwards that the same Christ is both « ante omnes » and « the Firstborn from the dead »; ante omnes, because He is God, and the Firstborn from the dead, because He became man. Concerning the death of Christ on the

---

(1) Le Quien, ibid., p. 732.
(2) Op. cit., p. iii, note 4.
(3) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 4*a*, col. 2, lines 2-21.

Cross, Philoxenus defends against the Nestorians the proposition « The Immortal died », and shows how he understands it. First of all, he postulates faith as a necessary condition to believe that Christ died, because faith is not needed to believe that God is immortal, and that man is mortal. Then he takes up in order his adversaries' objections. These were contained in a letter or treatise ('eggarthā), which seems to have had considerable influence on the religious polemics of the times [1]. The following are the principal objections with which he deals:

a) How can God be at the same time mortal and immortal?

b) Since angels do not die, how can God, Who made them immortal, die?

c) If Life died, who gave it life again?

d) Who ruled the universe, the three days that God was in the grave?

In answer to those different objections, Philoxenus shows that the Word of God suffered only in so far as He became man; that He was not a sufferer by nature, but by His will; that, when He was lying dead in the grave, He was living the life of His divinity, for the life which He commended on the Cross into the hands of His Father, was not His divine life, but the life which He had taken from us.

Towards the end of the letter, Philoxenus rejects the words « Christ King », which Calandion had inserted into the Trisagion of Peter the Fuller. He condemns the addition as bringing in Christ after the three divine persons, or as introducing a fourth person into the Trinity.

Philoxenus closes his letter with an anathema against Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and with the declaration that he is ready to die for his faith.

---

(1) Guidi, op. cit., p. v.

CHAPTER III.

THE DOCTRINES OF PHILOXENUS.

A) His Doctrine on the Incarnation.

General Considerations.

13. The dogma of the Incarnation was the principal theme of religious controversy in the fifth century of the Church. The disputes with the Gnostics, the Arians, and the Apollinarists had given rise to many discussions on the person of Christ. In opposition to all heresies, the Church always invoked the authority and voice of tradition affirming clearly the unity of the person of the God-man and the existence of two natures in Him. But the manner of union of the two natures had not been explained (1). The Fathers illustrated it by means of figures and comparisons, but did not always speak of it with strict philosophical accuracy. Any explanation that did not preserve the unity of person and the existence and distinction of the two natures in Christ was bound to end in error (2). And such, indeed, was the case. Here we see two different schools at work: the school of Antioch and the school of Alexandria. By applying their own theories to christological questions which, first of all, demanded faith as a necessary condition for their acceptance, they caused the two great heresies of Nestorianism and Eutychianism.

---

(1) Hergenröther, *Histoire de l'Eglise, traduction ~~de P. Bélet~~,* vol. II, n. 126, p. 201.

(2) Hergenröther, ibid.

The school of Antioch insisted specially on the human element in Christ and on the permanent distinction of the natures after the union (1). Some, however, confounding the notions of nature and person, went so far as to acknowledge not only two natures but two persons also (2). They did not admit that the human nature could exist complete and perfect in Christ without its connatural subsistence or personality, and, instead of uniting the human nature with the divine person, they united a human person with the person of the Word.

Different was the course pursued by the theologians of the school of Alexandria. They dwelt willingly on the divine element in Christ and on the mysterious union of the natures (3). Some applied the trichotomy of Plato to the dogma of the Incarnation, and, believing that man was made up of three factors, body, soul (ψυχή), and spirit (νοῦς), taught that Christ consisted of the body, the soul, and the Logos (4). According to them, the Son of God was incarnate without the rational soul (νοῦς), whose place was taken and filled by the Logos Himself. Others held the absorption of the human nature by and into the divine (5). Others again taught that the body of Christ was consubstantial with His divine nature, and that, on the day of the consummation, all things would become of one nature with the divinity (6).

Still another class combined, so to speak, the tendencies of the two schools; and, although they held that the humanity of Christ was real, nay, consubstantial with ours, they refused to it the name of nature, and spoke, not of two natures in

---

(1) Cf. HERGENRÖTHER, op. cit., vol. II, n. 98, p. 134; also VACANT, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, art. Antioche, p. 1435.
(2) Nestorians.
(3) Cf. VACANT, op. cit., art. Alexandrie, p. 805.
(4) HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. II, p. 142.
(5) Strict Eutychians.
(6) The Syrian Stephen Bar Sudaili.

Christ, but of a twofold or composite nature, consisting of the divinity and the humanity, united after the manner of the soul and the body in man. This heresy is known by the name of Monophysitism *in specie* (1) or Jacobite Monophysitism, in contradistinction from Eutychianism proper. Philoxenus and Severus of Antioch were the principal champions of this doctrine in the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth, and it may be said that they reduced it to a theological system. Philoxenus devoted his life to its propagation. Most of his dogmatic works were written in its defence. It is touched upon in many of his writings, particularly in the three letters the text of which is given here for the first time. The Letter to the Monks deals with the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches; the first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal was written to confirm those monks in the Monophysite doctrines which they shared with him, and the Letter to Zeno may be regarded as Philoxenus' own profession of faith in the mystery of the Incarnation.

In the light of these three documents and of his other published works, we shall consider how Philoxenus opposes Nestorius and Eutyches, and thus we shall be able to form an accurate notion of his views on the Incarnation, and on other points of belief of which he speaks in connection with the main subject.

Philoxenus and Nestorius.

14. There is no doubt that Philoxenus was well acquainted with the tenets of Nestorianism, for he had studied in the Persian school of Edessa, which was at the time openly favorable to that heresy. Ibas had translated into Syriac the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus, and two of his

---

(1) Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. II, p. 564.

disciples, Mari of Bēth-Ardašir and Mārūn Elithā, spread the Nestorian doctrines in the East (1). Philoxenus was one of those who opposed Ibas (2). This opposition which he began when only a student, he continued all his life, and to his efforts and those of his friends is principally due the fact that Nestorianism became confined to the Syrians of the Persian empire.

Heresy of Nestorius.

15. Nestorius, confounding the notions of nature and person, could not think of the human nature in Christ without its connatural subsistence. Hence, he understood the union of the natures in this way, that a man, integral and complete, was first formed in the Virgin Mary and united afterwards with the Word of God: « Scire autem convenit etiam de dispensatione quam pro nostra salute in Domino Christo Dominus Deus implevit, quod Deus Verbum hominem perfectum adsumpsit ex semine Abraham, et ex David juxta praedicationem Sanctarum Scripturarum, ejus naturae cujus et illi fuerunt ex quorum semine erat, hominem natura perfectum, ex anima rationali et humana carne compositum » (3). We find the same teaching in a homily (4) of the famous Nestorian poet Narses († 507), a contemporary of Philoxenus. Speaking of Diodorus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius, he says: « The just have interpreted one essence which is three, and have joined to it a man through the union » (5).

---

(1) Duval, *Histoire d'Edesse*, p. 177.

(2) *B. O.*, I, p. 352.

(3) Labbe-Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. V, p. 696.

(4) *Homélie de Narsès sur les trois docteurs Nestoriens*, par l'Abbé F. Martin, in the *Journal Asiatique*; Introduction and Syriac text, 9th series, tome XIV, pp. 446-492; French translation, 9th series, tome XV, pp. 469-525.

(5) Ibid., tome XIV, p. 453, lines 18-19.

Against this doctrine, Philoxenus holds that the Word was not united to a man first created in the womb of the Virgin, but that He became man of the Virgin without ceasing to be God. Thus, in the Letter to Zeno, he says: « But I see, with the eye of faith, a Spiritual Being, Who, without change, became corporal, and Mary brought forth, not a double (Son), as Nestorius said, but the Only-Begotten embodied, Who is not indeed half God and half man, but wholly God because He is from the Father, and wholly man because He became (man) of the Virgin » (1). According to him, the body of the Lord was His own, and not of another, as he says in the Letter to the Monks: « But it is not at all in the sense that a man or a body distinct from God died, that death is spoken of God, as it is not in the sense that a man or the body of another person distinct from God was born that birth is spoken of God; for, it was not a body that was born, but it was God, Who became a body and remained in His nature God; and it was not a body that was crucified, but it was God, Who became man, and in His death did not lose His life » (2).

The Word *Θεοτόκος*.

16. From Nestorius' theory on the union of the natures, it follows necessarily that Mary cannot be called *Θεοτόκος*, Mother of God. And this title, in the sense in which Catholics understand it, he always refused to her. Thus, in his first sermon on the Incarnation, he says: « Habet matrem Deus? Ergo excusabilis gentilitas matres diis subintroducens. Paulus ergo mendax, de Christi deitate dicens, *ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἄνευ γενεαλογίας* (Heb. vii, 3), id est, sine patre, sine matre, sine generationis

(1) P. 120.
(2) P. 99.

narratione » [1]. The Word, he argues, merely passed through the Virgin, but was not born of her: « *Transiisse* Deum per Virginem *χριστοτόκον*, a Scriptura perdoctus sum; *natum*, non edoctus sum » [2].

Philoxenus teaches clearly that Mary is Mother of God. and that the Word was born of her. In the Letter to the Monks, he says: « For the Virgin was not indeed a channel (through which) God (passed), but His true Mother, because He became man of her » [3]. In the Letter to Zeno, speaking of Mary, he uses the words « yāldath 'alāhā », which are the exact Syriac equivalent of the Greek *Θεοτόκος*: « We confess, therefore, that the Virgin is *Θεοτόκος* (yāldath 'alāhā), and we believe that the embodied Word, after being born of her corporally, was wrapped in swaddling clothes, sucked milk, received circumcision, was held on (His Mother's) knees, grew in stature and was subject to His parents, all this just as He was born » [4]. Furthermore, Philoxenus argues that, by denying to Mary the title of Mother of God, we necessarily deny the divinity of Christ. Thus, in the eighteenth of his *Twenty Chapters against Nestorius*, he writes: « If the Virgin is Mother of God, He Who was born (of her) is God. But the one, who was born of the Virgin, who is he? Jesus Christ. Now, if Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin, and if the Virgin is Mother of God, then Jesus Christ is God and not a man in whom God dwelt » [5]. And he defends this peerless prerogative of Mary not only against the Nestorians, but also against the Eutychians who, by holding that the body of Christ was not consubstantial with ours, were obliged to say that the Word became incarnate in, but not of the Virgin: « We do not say, like the erring disciples of Eutyches,

(1) In Marius Mercator, Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 48, p. 760.
(2) *Sermon* V, n. 8; Migne, *P. L.*, ibid., p. 787.
(3) P. 97.
(4) P. 122.
(5) Budge, op. cit., vol. II, p. cxxxv.

that He (the Word) was embodied in the Virgin, but not of her; but we believe (that He was embodied) *in* her and *of* her, and not in any other way He might have pleased, as those liars claim » (1).

Communicatio Idiomatum.

17. The *communicatio idiomatum*, by which we predicate the same properties of the two natures, not indeed in the abstract (Godhead and manhood), but in the concrete (God and man), is impossible in the system of Nestorius, because he regards the human nature as existing in its own subsistence, in other words, as a person. Thus he says that we cannot in any way attribute death to God: « Quid Dei nomen deputas morti, quod a divina Scriptura nusquam in mortis commemorationem profertur? Quid, Paulo clamante, cum audias: in viro, in quo definivit Deus, fidem praestans omnibus, suscitans eum a mortuis (Act., xvii, 31), tu natam et mortuam inani imaginatione judicas Deitatem? » (2). And more generally in his fourth counter-anathema against Cyril: « If any one assigns the expressions of the Gospels and Apostolic letters, which refer to the two natures in Christ, to one only of these natures, and attributes even suffering to the Divine Logos, both in the flesh and in the Godhead, let him be anathema » (3). Similar is the teaching of Narses: « To the human nature belong the humiliations of the human nature, and not to the nature raised and exalted above sufferings; to the man belongs all that was written of the Son of man: conception, birth, growth, suffering, and death » (4).

(1) P. 102.
(2) *Sermon* VII, n.° 45: Migne, ibid., p. 800.
(3) Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. II, p. 174.
(4) *Journal Asiatique*, op. cit., tome XIV, p. 476, line 25, and p. 477, lines 1-3.

Thus we see that the Nestorians deny the *communicatio idiomatum* because they consider the human nature as existing in Christ with its own personality; Philoxenus rejects the *communicatio idiomatum* by the mere fact that he acknowledges only one nature after the union. He does not admit that we can attribute to the divine person what we deny of the divine nature. Thus, in the ninth of his *Twenty Chapters against Nestorius*, he writes: « If thou sayest that Christ is two natures, a divine nature and a human nature, and one person, and if thou givest to the divine person the properties of the divine nature and the properties of the human nature, why dost thou give to the divine person humiliation and glory and yet put them away from the divine nature? Is His divine person inferior to His divine nature? What His person is, is not that also His nature? » (1) And, arguing against those who admit two natures and one person in Christ after the union, Philoxenus contends that their doctrine involves us in hopeless confusion. In the sixteenth chapter of the same tract, he says: « How is there no confusion, when thou confessest two natures and one person? For, when thou sayest » two natures which run with their attributes, their properties, and their operations », and when thou attributest the divine things to the divine nature, and the human things to the human nature, how can confusion be avoided? Thou answerest (that thou avoidest confusion) by attributing to one person the properties of the divine nature and the properties of the human nature. But tell me: To which nature does this one person belong? To the divine nature, or to the human? If (it belongs) to the divine nature, behold, the properties of the human nature do not belong to the divine person; and if (it belongs) to the human nature, behold, the properties of the divine nature do not belong to the human person. Is there a greater confusion than

(1) Budge, op. cit., vol. II, p. cxxix.

tatem » [1]. The words of Narses, in the homily already quoted, are almost identical: « One is the Word, the Son of the Father, without beginning; and one is the man from the humanity of Adam. The Son of God is two by nature, in every thing that belongs to the Supreme Being and to the man, but one by honor and by authority » [2]. It is only on the basis of that moral union that Nestorius admits one Christ, and, in Christ, one prosopon, one will, one operation. Similarly, the Nestorian Syrians, in their doctrine on the Incarnation, speak of two substances ('ousiā), two essences ('īthūthā), two natures (keyānā), two hypostases (qenomā), but of one prosopon (parṣopā), one image (ṣalmā), one will (ṣebhyānā), one operation (maʿbedhānūthā), one virtue (ḥaylā), and one power (šulṭānā) [3].

According to Philoxenus, Christ is one not merely because there is only one person in Him, but in the sense also that, after the Incarnation, there is only one nature in Him, a nature consisting of the divinity and the humanity, as he says in the Letter to Zeno: « Of the one Son, therefore, are the two generations, the one from the Father and the other from the Virgin; of the one Son, and not of two natures, otherwise He would not be one. And if we admit (in Him) nature and nature, we must necessarily admit person and person, and consequently we must acknowledge two Sons and two Gods » [4].

As another consequence of his theory on the union of the two natures, Nestorius claimed that the same worship must be given to both: « Propter utentem illud indumentum quo utitur colo; propter absconditum adoro quod foris videtur; inseparabilis ab eo qui foris paret est Deus » [5]. Not only is the same worship

---

(1) Migne, ibid., p. 766.

(2) *Journal Asiatique*, op. cit., tome XIV, p. 453, lines 22-25.

(3) Assemani, *B. O.*, III, pars 2a, p. 218. Cf. also Chabot, *De S. Isaaci Ninivitae vita, scriptis et doctrina*, p. 23.

(4) P. 121.

(5) Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 48, p. 762.

given to both, but the man in whom the Word dwelt is actually called God, and honored as such: « Non per seipsum Deus est qui in utero figuratus est: nam si sic esset, essemus hominis vere cultores; sed quoniam in assumpto Deus est, ex illo qui assumpsit, qui assumptus est, appellatus est, et appellatur Deus » (1). Hence it is that Nestorius was accused of introducing a fourth person into the Trinity. Thus, Proclus, bishop of Cyzicus, in a sermon preached in Constantinople against Nestorius, said: « Si alter Christus et alter Dei Verbum, non jam Trinitas, sed quaternitas erit » (2). Philoxenus makes the same objection against the Nestorians. In the Letter to the Monks of Beth-Gaugal, he says: « He who distinguishes Christ into two does not worship the Trinity » (3). Also, in the Letter to the Monks, he writes: « For he who counts another man with God, introduces a quaternity in his doctrine and corrupts the dogma of the Holy Trinity. With pagans is such a doctrine to be counted, for, like them, it errs inventing a new god, against that which is written, 'There shall not be to thee a new god'. It adores a new god, a man born of a woman » (4). He urges again the same objection against Catholics for acknowledging two natures in Christ, as we may infer from a passage in his short treatise on the heresies of Mani, Marcion, and others: « And that addition (the definition of two natures in Christ) which took place at Chalcedon, admits a quaternity and brings in Christ after the Trinity » (5).

Finally, according to the Nestorians, the man, in whom the Word dwelt, merited the title of God by dying for us on the Cross and paying Adam's debt, on account of which God raised him from the dead, bestowed immortality upon him, and exalted him (6). Philoxenus rejects this doctrine and teaches emphati-

(1) Migne, ibid.
(2) Migne, ibid., p. 780.
(3) P. 110.
(4) P. 103.
(5) Budge, op. cit., vol. II, p. cxxxvii, line 17.
(6) Cf. Labbe-Mansi, op. cit., vol. V, p. 696.

cally that the Word of God was born and died for us, and that He is immortal by nature, as he says in the Letter to the Monks of Beth-Gaugal: « He who says that Christ was justified by His works, and became the equal of the Most High by the practice of His virtues, and that He is not exalted and is not God by His nature, such a one is without any virtue and is filled with the malice of the devil » (1). And he urges, furthermore, the irresistible argument that, if God has not suffered for us in the flesh, we have not been redeemed: « If the death and the suffering were of another, the redemption and life which were merited for me would be of man, not of God » (2). This argument he develops at greater length in his Letter to the Monks of Teleda: « By His grace He (Christ) became our brother; by His grace, we became His brothers. For by the grace (of God), there are two wonderful things: the Most High was humbled, and the humble ones were exalted. God became man, and the sons of men (became) sons of God. There was first the humiliation of God and, after that, the exaltation of man. For he who was low could not be exalted near Him Who was high, unless the High One descended to the low one. Such was the beginning of God's new way towards us » (3).

Philoxenus and Eutyches.

20. One of the most zealous opponents of Nestorianism was Eutyches, archimandrite of a monastery outside the walls of Constantinople (4). He boasted that he had fought for the faith at Ephesus. Although he was not present there in person, there is no doubt that he contributed greatly to the overthrow of the party of Nestorius (5). However his intemperate zeal and super-

(1) P. 113.
(2) P. 109.
(3) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 5a, col. 2, lines 3-23.
(4) Hefele, op. cit., vol. II, p. 317.
(5) Hefele, ibid.

ficial learning carried him into the opposite error, and he accused of heresy every one who spoke of two natures. Unable to grasp the difference between the Nestorian heresy and the Catholic doctrine, he rejected not only two persons in Christ, but two natures as well, and admitted only one nature after the union. He was excommunicated by the Council of Chalcedon (451), but his heresy did not end with his condemnation. It was introduced successively into Palestine, Egypt, and Syria (1). How rapid was its progress may be seen from the fact that, a few years after the death of Eutyches, the two great sees of Antioch and Alexandria were occupied by Monophysite bishops.

The error was held in various forms. Although all Monophysites admitted only one nature in Christ, they differed in explaining how the Godhead and the humanity could form one nature; hence the anomalous fact that many of them, especially those who were not of Greek origin, whilst professing one nature like the Eutychians, anathematized alike Eutyches and the Council of Chalcedon. This is particularly true of Philoxenus, as is clear from many passages of his writings in which he speaks of the doctrines of Eutyches. These we shall consider presently.

Heresy of Eutyches.

21. Nestorius denies the unity of the person of Christ; Eutyches exaggerates it, and goes so far as to teach the unity of nature (2). He acknowledges only one nature after the union, that of God made flesh and man: « Post incarnationem vero Dei Verbi, hoc est, post nativitatem Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, unam naturam adorare, et hanc Dei incarnati et inhumanati » (3). He interprets in his own heretical sense the famous words of Cyril to Succensus: « But we say one Son, and, as the Fathers have spoken, one

(1) Hefele, op. cit., vol. II, p. 564.
(2) Hergenröther, op. cit., vol. II, n.° 142, p. 228.
(3) Harduin, *Acta Conciliorum*, vol. II, p. 142.

incarnate nature of God the Word » (1). As is evident, however, from the context of the letter, from his own explanation to Acacius of Melitene (2), and from the testimony of others (3), Cyril, in this passage, takes the word « nature » (φύσις) in the meaning of « subsistence or person ». Eutyches takes it in the meaning of « nature », not indeed in the sense simply that the divine nature was united with the human, but in a compound sense, so as to admit after the Incarnation, after the union of the Godhead and the flesh, only one nature. Hence, he says that Christ is from two natures, *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, but not in two, *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν*: « Confiteor ex duabus naturis fuisse Dominum Nostrum ante adunationem; post adunationem vero unam naturam confiteor » (4).

Like Eutyches, Philoxenus admits only one nature in Christ after the union, one nature consisting of the divinity and the humanity. In the Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal, we read: « He who says that the name of Christ signifies two natures distinct and separate the one from the other, and not one nature (keyānā), and one prosopon (parṣopā), and one person (qenomā), who was embodied and became man of the Virgin, such a one denies the faith and is worse than those who do not believe » (5). He also misinterprets the words of Cyril which we have quoted above. The expression « one nature who was embodied » is very common in Philoxenus' writings, and it always occurs in a Monophysite sense, as implying only one nature in Christ after the union. In the same Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal, he says: « He who does not confess that glory and humiliation are of one Son, Who is one person and one nature who was embodied, such

(1) *Ἀλλ' ἕνα φαμὲν Υἱὸν, καὶ ὡς οἱ Πατέρες εἰρήκασι, μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην.* Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 77, p. 232.

(2) Migne, ibid., p. 181.

(3) Thus Justinian, *Liber adv. Origen.*, in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86, p. 1001, says: « *Καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ πατὴρ (Κυρίλλος) ὁσάκις μίαν φύσιν εἶπε τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, ἐπὶ τούτου τῷ τῆς φύσεως ὀνόματι ἀντὶ ὑποστάσεως ἐχρήσατο* ».

(4) Harduin, op. cit., vol. II, p. 166.

(5) P. 111.

a one is an embodied devil » (1). Thus again, in the first of his *Twenty Chapters against Nestorius*, he writes: « If God the Word and His nature are one, and if God is not one thing, and His nature another, why, when thou comest to (the word) ' God ', dost thou say ' one God who was embodied ', and when thou comest to the word ' nature ', why dost thou not say ' one nature who was embodied ', instead of two natures? » (2) And in the seventh chapter of the same tract, he argues: « If the Word, after He was embodied, is two natures, the Word, after He was embodied, is two persons also; but if the person of the embodied Word is one, the nature of the embodied Word is one also, for the person of the Word is not inferior to His nature » (3). So far Philoxenus agrees with Eutyches, and, by the expression « one embodied nature of the Word », he understands one nature after the Incarnation, one nature consisting of the divinity and the humanity. He also says in his Letter to the Monks that Christ is from two (men tartēn), that is, from the divinity and the humanity: « Let us beware of the impiety of those who say that the Virgin brought forth God and a man; who divide and count two in Him Who is the Only Son of God, Who is from two, from the divinity and from the humanity; (of the impiety of those) who divide (Christ), and in this one God Who was embodied, attribute humiliation to the one and glory to the other, power to the one and weakness to the other » (4).

Manner of Union.

22. Thus, we see that Philoxenus agrees with the Eutychians in teaching one nature in Christ after the Incarnation; but he differs from them in his explanation of the union. As St. Thomas

(1) P. 113.
(2) Budge, op. cit., vol. II, p. cxxiii.
(3) Budge, ibid., p. cxxvi.
(4) P. 98.

observes, some one thing may result from the union of two others in three ways: « Uno modo ex duobus integris perfectis remanentibus; quod quidem fieri non potest, nisi in iis quorum forma est compositio, vel ordo, vel figura...; alio modo, fit aliquid unum ex perfectis, sed transmutatis...; tertio modo, fit aliquid ex aliquibus non permixtis, sed imperfectis, sicut ex anima et corpore fit homo » (1). And he shows that none of these ways could take place in the Incarnation; not the first, because it would make the union of the two natures merely accidental; nor the second, because it would imply mutability in the divine nature; nor the third, because it would suppose the divine nature and the human nature to be both incomplete *ratione naturae*. Eutyches did not explain himself clearly on the manner of the union (2), but there is no doubt that those of his disciples, who were called strict Monophysites, taught a mingling or confusion of the two natures (3). Philoxenus rejects this explanation on the ground that it does away with the immutability of the Word. Thus, in the Letter to the Monks, he says: « there having been neither change, nor mixture, nor confusion in His nature, as God Himself said by the Prophet, « I am, and I change not ». For He Who was not made is not mutable; He Who was not created cannot change. Therefore, He became man without change; He was embodied, and remained as He is, spiritual (4). And, in his Letter to Zeno, he tells us how he understands the words of St. John « And the Word was made flesh »: « With John I cry out that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, not by changing, God forbid! for 'to change' is a modification, but 'to become' belongs to the Economy (of the Word). For I learn from John and Paul that (the Word) has become; but that He was changed, none of those who saw and served the Word

(1) *Summa Theologica*, pars 3a, q. 2a, art. I.
(2) Cf. Hergenröther, op. cit., vol. II, n° 144, p. 230.
(3) Cf. Harduin, op. cit., vol. II, p. 454.
(4) P. 96-97.

(ever) said. Besides, God the Word Himself teaches by His Prophet, 'I am the Lord, and I change not'. Where you would suppose that, by becoming embodied, He was changed, He testifies all the more to the truth of His own immutability, and, as if already embodied from the Virgin, He cries out to those who think that perhaps He was changed by becoming (man), 'I am the Lord, and I change not' » (1).

Philoxenus holds then that the Word was not changed by becoming man, and so far he is orthodox; but he draws a wrong conclusion from the truth which he admits, for he refuses to consider the humanity as a nature; and, to safeguard the immutability of the Word, he argues against Nestorians and Catholics alike that by teaching two natures after the Incarnation they admit a change, since before the Incarnation there is only one nature. Hence, his favorite expression « it is after the Incarnation as before », which in his writings does not mean simply that the Word was not changed by becoming man, but implies besides, that, as there is only one nature before the Incarnation, so there can be but one after the Incarnation. He did not acknowledge that the assuming of the human nature by the person of the Word did not perfect the Word in any way, and did not interfere in the least with the immutability of the divine nature. He regards the divinity and the humanity in Christ as forming one nature which the Jacobites call a composite (merakkebhā) or double (ʿaffīfā) nature (2), and the example he adduces to illustrate the union, is the example of the union of the soul and the body into one human nature (3). His position is impossible, for the divinity and the humanity are complete in Christ, whilst the body and the soul of man are both incomplete *ratione naturae*.

(1) P. 121.
(2) *B. O.*, II, p. 25.
(3) *B. O.*, II, p. 26.

But although Philoxenus insists on the fact that the Word became man without change, he is not always consistent, and some of his expressions would point to a confusion of the two natures in Christ. Thus, in the tract ܬܘܒ ܕܪܫܐ ܕܚܝܐ ܕܢܣܛܘܪܝܢܘ ܘܐܪܬܕܘܟܣܘ which is a theological discussion between a Nestorian and an Orthodox (Monophysite) [1], the Nestorian asks: « Is the humanity, (which the divinity has put on), finite? », and the Orthodox (Monophysite) answers: « We believe that it is infinite, for there is not in it (the divinity) duality of natures and quaternity of persons, but only unification of natures and trinity of persons. It is after the embodiment of the Dispensation (Incarnation) as before » [2].

Monotheletism.

23. One of the logical consequences of the heresy of Eutyches was Monotheletism, for if there is only one nature in Christ, there can be but one will and one operation in Him. Hence, the Council of Chalcedon, in defining against Eutyches the existence of the two natures, states also that the properties of each nature are preserved: « Nusquam sublata differentia naturarum propter unitionem, magisque salva proprietate utriusque naturae » [3].

Like the Eutychians, Philoxenus admits Monotheletism, and teaches categorically that there is only one will and one operation in Christ. Thus, in his profession of faith entitled ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ, he says: « We do not acknowledge in Him (Christ) two sons, nor two persons, nor two wills, nor two natures; one, God, and

(1) This tract is extant in Syr. Ms. 135 of the Vatican library, and is as yet unpublished. We quote from a copy in the possession of Prof. Hyvernat.

(2) ܗܘ. ܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܡܣܬܝܟܢܝܬܐ ܗܝ . ܐ. ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܣܬܝܟܢܝܬܐ ܗܝ. ܡܛܠ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܗ ܬܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܘܐܪܒܥܝܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܐܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܚܕܝܘܬܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܘܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡ ܡܬܓܫܡܘܬܐ ܘܒܬܪ ܡܬܓܫܡܘܬܐ ܕܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ.

(3) HARDUIN, op. cit., vol. II, p. 455.

the other, man » (1). And again, in the same document: « If any one confesses in the Only Begotten two persons or two wills, or admits a distinction of persons after the union in the womb, let him be anathema » (2). Such is also the doctrine of his famous neighbor and contemporary, Jacob of Serugh, who, in his second Letter to the Monks of Mār Bassus, says: « I anathematize also those who, after the union, divide, and confess, and count in one Christ (two) natures with their properties, attributes, and operations, so as to give to God what is God's and to man what is man's » (3).

Reality of the Body of Christ.

24. Another important question in christological controversies was the reality of the body of Christ. By holding the confusion of the two natures and the absorption of the human by and into the divine, strict Eutychians were led to deny the consubstantiality of the body of Christ with ours. Hence the assertion of Eutyches that, although the Blessed Virgin was consubstantial with us, the body of Christ was not (4). He did not explain himself on the origin of the body of the Lord. According to Gennadius (5), he taught with the Gnostics that the Word brought His body down from heaven. This charge, however, he denied at the Council of Constantinople in 448 (6). Philoxenus accuses him of holding that the body of Christ was made out of nothing.

(1) *B. O.*, II, p. 33.
(2) Ibid., p. 34.
(3) *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 30, p. 235, lines 15-17. The letters of Jacob of Serugh to the Monks of Mār Bassus and to Paul of Edessa have been published and translated by Abbé Martin in the *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 30, pp. 217-275. They prove beyond all reasonable doubt that Jacob of Serugh was a Monophysite.
(4) « *ὅς οὐδὲ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν ἔλεγεν εἶναι* », in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86 bis, p. 2445.
(5) *Liber Dogmatum*, in Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 58, p. 981.
(6) Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. II, p. 322.

Whatever may have been Eutyches' own opinion on this point, there is no doubt that his doctrine leaned towards Docetism, and consequently did not appeal to the Syrian Monophysites who had been schooled in the traditions of Antioch and of Edessa. This may account partly for the fact that his doctrines found but few followers among the Monophysites of the East; indeed, they made no difficulty in anathematizing Eutyches and his opinions (1).

Philoxenus, by teaching that the divinity and the humanity in Christ, although forming but one nature, are not confused nor mingled in any way, is able, from his own point of view, to deny some of the consequences which follow necessarily from Eutyches' doctrine; and so, in the Letter to the Monks, he rejects the Gnostic and Eutychian theories about the origin of the body of the Lord: « He (the Word) did not bring His body down from heaven, as Bardesanes said; nor was He seen under a false appearance or a phantom, according to the blasphemy of Mani and Marcion; nor was (His body) made from nothing, as said Eutyches the fool; nor was His nature changed, as the wicked Arius and Eunomius imagine; nor was He, Who was embodied, without (human) intelligence, according to the blasphemous doctrine of Apollinaris; but He Who is perfect God took a body, and became perfect man of the Virgin » (2). Hence he asserts repeatedly that the Word became incarnate in the Virgin, and of the Virgin, and not simply in the Virgin as Eutyches contended: « The Word was not embodied in the Virgin, as if not also of the Virgin, but He truly became man *in* her and *of* her (3).

The reality of the body of Christ is a frequent theme in Philoxenus' writings. He dwells on it at great length in his

(1) Renaudot, *Historia patriarcharum alexandrinorum jacobitarum*, p. 115.

(2) P. 97.

(3) P. 97.

Letter to the Monks of Teleda, and says not only that the humanity of Christ is real, but that, through the manifestation of that same real humanity, we are led to believe in the divinity of the Son of God. Commenting on St. Luke, xxiv, 39, he says: « To this end Jesus was seen in true manifestation, that He might teach us that His hidden divinity is true. For, O heretic, Thomas did not touch an appearance, but the real humanity of God. To show us that He was not changed by becoming incarnate, He (Christ) said, 'I have flesh and bones', but did not say, 'I am (flesh and bones)', lest by saying 'I am' thou shouldst suppose a change. For He said: 'A spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have', and not '(as you see) that I am'. I am a Spirit because I am God; I have flesh and bones because I became a body and was not changed. Touch the flesh and the bones, and make certain that I am; put thy hand in the places of the nails and of the lance, and believe that I became incarnate. Hear the words 'I have' and not 'I am', and believe that I was not changed. By the touch make sure of the corporeity; from the word believe the immutability; with the finger touch the corporeity; from the word of doctrine understand the spirituality » (1). Again, in the same letter, commenting on the first verse of the first epistle of St. John, Philoxenus writes: « How can this be 'We have handled and have seen with our eyes the Word of life' if it was an appearance and not a reality that was assumed, as the blasphemer Eutyches said? How can this be 'We have handled the Word', if, as he says, it was an appearance that was handled? And this again 'Touch and see because I have flesh and bones?' Therefore, let us cry out against these two (Nestorius and Eutyches) with a voice full of truth and life and faith, that He Who was touched was God incarnate, the Word

(1) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 20a, col. 2, line 16 - fol. 20b, col. 1, line 21.

Who became flesh truly, not a man distinct from God, nor an appearance without reality » (1).

Not only does Philoxenus insist on the reality of the humanity of Christ, but he urges against his opponents the irresistible argument that, if the body of Christ was not real, two of the great ends of the Incarnation — the reparation of fallen human nature and our sonship with God through Christ — could not be obtained (2). Thus in the Letter to Zeno, he says: « For He (the Word) did not bring to Himself a body from heaven as the foolish Valentinus and Bardesanes assert; nor was His embodiment from nothing, because He did not wish to redeem a creature that did not exist, but He wished to renew that which, created by Him, had become old » (3). In the Letter to the Monks he says that, unless the Son of God took upon Himself our humanity, we could not have become the sons of God: « Herein then is a great mystery of profound love and of ineffable salvation, that He Who is became, not that He might be since He is, but that we, through His becoming (Incarnation), might become the sons of God » (4). And again, in the Letter to Zeno, « The Word, therefore, became something that He was not, and remained something that we were not (but became),

(1) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 20b, col. 2, line 19 - fol. 21a, col. 1, line 6.

(2) From this we see how groundless is the assertion of Theophanes (Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 384) and of Cedrenus (Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 121, p. 693) who accuse Philoxenus of Manicheism. This charge is sufficiently refuted by his opinion on the reality of the body of Christ; besides, he condemns Mani and Manicheism explicitly. In the Letter to the Monks of Beth-Gaugal, he says: « He who says that the aspect of Christ was a false appearance, and not a real embodiment from the nature of the Virgin, is a disciple of Mani and Marcion » (p. 114). And in the Letter to the Monks of Teleda, « It was not an appearance that the Apostles touched, O Manichean, nor a mere man, O Jew ». (Guidi, op. cit., fol. 20b, col. 1, lines 26-29).

(3) P. 119.

(4) P. 101.

that is, sons of God. For we became sons of God, although our nature was not changed » (1).

Other Consequences of the Eutychian Theory.

25. From their theory on the union of the two natures in Christ, the Eutychians could not avoid one or the other of the two alternatives: either the divinity suffered, or the sufferings of Christ were not real. Many of them held that the divine nature in Christ suffered, as we know from the preamble to the definition of the Council of Chalcedon: « Et illos qui passibilem deitatem Unigeniti ausi sunt dicere, a sacro coetu expellit (Synodus) » (2). Others attributed suffering to the whole Trinity. Such was probably the meaning intended by Peter Fuller (3), patriarch of Antioch, when, in the year 477 (4), he added to the Trisagion (5),

---

(1) P. 119. Cf. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, lib. XXI, c. XV, in Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 41, p. 729: « Unicus enim natura Dei Filius, propter nos misericordia factus est filius hominis, ut nos natura filii hominis, filii Dei per illum gratia fieremus ».

(2) Harduin, op. cit., vol. II, p. 455.

(3) Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. XVI, p. 301.

(4) Baronius, *Annales eccl.*, anno 477.

(5) During the year 446, earthquakes were frequently felt in Constantinople. One day, the earth shaking more violently than usual, the clergy and the faithful withdrew into the country, and offered public prayers for the salvation of their city. During one of these public services, a boy was suddenly taken up into the air before the bishop and the people, and it is said that he heard the angels sing: *ἅγιος ὁ θεὸς, ἅγιος ἰσχυρὸς, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς*. Such was the origin of the Trisagion. In the Latin Church it is sung in Greek on Good Friday during the exposition of the Cross to the veneration of the faithful, and it is recited in Latin at Prime of the Ferial office. Peter the Fuller inserted into the Trisagion the words « *ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς* ». This addition was capable of a twofold interpretation. The Catholics who accepted it, and some Monophysites, understood it as referring to Christ alone. Other Monophysites, and especially the Theopaschites, understood this addition as meaning that the whole Trinity had suffered. To remove all ambiguity, Calandion, patriarch of Antioch (482-485), added the words « *Χριστὸς Βασιλεύς* » after *ἀθάνατος*,

the words « Who wast crucified for us », which gave rise to bitter theological disputes, and, on one occasion, nearly cost the emperor Anastasius his throne and his life (1).

By denying the confusion of the divinity and the humanity in that one nature which he admits, Philoxenus is able, from his own point of view, to avoid the conclusion that the divinity suffered. He clearly teaches that Christ suffered only in the flesh. The many passages in which he speaks of the death of the Saviour leave no doubt as to his belief on this point.

Thus, in the Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal, he says: « The Spiritual One did not die in so far as He is spiritual, and God did not suffer in so far as He is God. He has no beginning, to the extent that He is without beginning in his generation from the Father. He suffered, therefore, because He took a body, and He died because He became a brother of mortals » (2). In the Letter to Zeno, speaking of the death and of the immortality of Christ, he writes: « The Cross is the herald of the death and of the immortality of God; for, until then, we believed by hearing that God is immortal; but, on the Cross, experience has shown (that) both (were true), for, whilst tasting death, He remained living. Death could not attack and destroy His life; but, by His death, the power of death was destroyed, so that this death (of the Son), after His becoming (man), is a miracle. For He Who suffered death for us was not mortal as one of us, otherwise the power of death over mortals would not have been destroyed. From all men we know that what is mortal shall die; but, that the Immortal be considered as having

---

thus referring explicitly the crucifixion to Christ alone. Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. XIV, p. 713 sqq.; Baronius, anno 446, *Annales*, vol., VII, p. 579 sqq.

(1) Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ed. Milman, vol. VI, p. 30; Marin *Les Moines de Constantinople*, p. 272.

(2) P. 109.

died corporally, is something new which took place once on the Cross » (1).

It is true that Philoxenus accepted the Trisagion with the addition made by Peter the Fuller, but he understood the addition to apply to Christ alone, as can be seen from the Letter to the Monks: « Nor did He (Christ) become immortal by being justified by His works, as the wicked followers of Nestorianism assert; but by His nature He is immortal because He is God, as the whole Church of God cries out in the Trisagion: « Thou art Holy, God; Thou art Holy, Strong One; Thou art Holy, Immortal One; (Thou) Who wast crucified for us, have mercy on us » (2). Thus far it might be objected that he agrees with the Theopaschites in attributing death to the divinity, but he immediately explains himself, and tells us what interpretation he puts on the Trisagion, and how he understands the addition of Peter the Fuller: « Thus does the true Church believe, thus do the tongues which are moved by truth cry out that He, Who is immortal by nature, God the Word, was crucified in body for all, not that a body or a man distinct from Him was suspended on the Cross » (3).

This doctrine is explained more fully in his Letter to the Monks of Teleda, and he shows clearly that the Word suffered only in so far as He became man. Thus, to the objection of his adversaries, « Since angels do not die, how is it believed that God died? » he answers: « First, to ask this question about God is a blasphemy. When thou hearest that God has done any thing, thou shouldst not ask how. Secondly, the angel, who is immortal by his nature, did not become man. But we first say of God, of Whom we confess that He died, that He became man, and then we attribute death to His person, so that it is

(1) P. 123-124.
(2) P. 101.
(3) P. 101.

seen that it is the death of His becoming, not of his essence, for the essence of God is above death » (1). And he says, furthermore, that the objection drawn from the angels and other spiritual natures is irrelevant, because none of them became incarnate, and that the Word alone died because He alone, of all spiritual natures, took a body: « Corporally, therefore, God died, and not spiritually, as He was born according to the flesh, and not in His essence. Not similar then is the example which thou bringest. If thou shouldst say that He tasted death before He became man of the Virgin, thou couldst well refute my argument by the example of spiritual natures; but if He is the only one Who had corporeity, and if it is not found in any other spiritual nature, nor in the eternal persons of the Father and of the Holy Ghost, nor in the spiritual nature of the angels, He, Who alone among spiritual natures, had by His will corporeity, to Him alone applies the fact of death, which cannot happen in the other spiritual natures. For, if it were written that other spiritual natures were incarnate, then death could be predicated of other spiritual natures; if, on the contrary, corporeity was not in any of them, then none of them tasted death. The Word alone became a body, as it is written, and in Him alone was the mystery of death accomplished corporally. As He alone of all spirits became a true body, so also, He alone of all spirits tasted death truly. Whilst the Father did not die, nor the Holy Ghost, nor any of the created spiritual natures, He alone was subject to death, because He alone became man from our nature » (2). And, in the Letter to the Monks of Beth-Gaugal, Philoxenus asserts that Christ lying in the grave as man, was, at that very time, the Ruler of the universe: « When He lay and reclined dead in Scheol, He was preparing, for all, resurrection, was ruling the hosts of heaven and all creatures by

(1) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 13a, col. 2, line 22 - fol. 13b, col. 1, line 13.
(2) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 15a, col. 2, line 26 - fol. 15b, col. 2, line 13.

His nod, creating bodies and putting the limbs together and breathing in the souls, and governing the worlds and all creatures, as God Who is everywhere » (1).

It is evident, therefore, from all these passages that Philoxenus attributes death to the Word of God, only in so far as He became man. He gives this as the belief of his church at the time, and such is, according to Renaudot (2) and Assemani (3), the common doctrine of the Jacobites.

As we remarked above, the Eutychians who denied that the divinity in Christ had suffered were forced to admit with the Gnostics that the sufferings of Christ were not real. It was a necessary consequence of their doctrine on the origin of the body of the Lord, which they said was not consubstantial with ours; for, as Philoxenus expresses it, « where there is no true corporeity, there cannot be any true death » (4). Philoxenus, however, by holding fast the reality of the humanity of Christ, puts himself in a position to deny the conclusion which the Eutychians could not escape. In his Letter to the Monks of Teleda, he expresses clearly his belief in the genuineness of the passion and death of Christ. Arguing against the Gnostics and the Eutychians, he says: « Do not corrupt, O rebel, the word of faith, and do not make it a phantom. For I did not say, and I do not say, and God forbid that I should say that those things were performed in the divine Economy in a false appearance. The becoming (man) and birth, and likewise the passion and death and all the human actions between these, all this took place really and truly, as becomes God. Not, indeed, as the angels appeared, was God seen in the world; not as the angels ate and drank in the house of Abraham and in the house

(1) P. 108.
(2) *Lit. or. coll.*, vol. II, p. 70.
(3) *B. O.*, II, p. 36.
(4) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 15a, col. 2, lines 2-6.

of Lot, did God eat and drink in the world. That (in the angels) took place in appearance only; this (in God) in the truth of corporeity. That is not similar to this, as said the heretic Eutyches and the followers of his diabolical doctrine » [1].

Theory of Philoxenus on the Sufferings of Christ.

26. Although Philoxenus teaches that Christ suffered truly and not in appearance, his theory concerning the nature of these sufferings and the manner in which the Saviour assumed and bore the infirmities and needs of humanity, is not in harmony with his own principles. Many passages in his writings go to show that he did not regard the body of Christ as passible by nature. Thus, in the Letter to the Monks, he says: « Everything that He (the Word) became, He became, not for Himself, but for us. For He vas not a sufferer by His nature, because, if He had suffered being a sufferer (by nature), He would have suffered for Himself » [2]. In the Letter to the Monks of Teleda, speaking of the human operations and defects (hunger, thirst, fatigue, etc.) which Christ assumed, he says that they were not in Christ as they are in us: « Not indeed as they are performed by man, were those things which I have enumerated in man performed by God. For they are performed by man naturally, but (they are performed) by God in the wonder of His Economy, supernaturally, in true wonder » [3]. And again, in the same letter, he writes: « Therefore, He (Christ) is also above death naturally, for His Incarnation took place in a holy manner, without intercourse, without the concupiscence of sin and death. Because there is not in Him any one of these things, His fight was not His own or for Himself; nor were the rest

---

(1) Guidi, ibid., fol. 19 a, col. 2, line 10; — fol. 19 b, col. 1, line 7.
(2) P. 101.
(3) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 19 a, col. 2, lines 1-9.

of the weak things which He assumed in His person (His own or for Himself); but, by His will He fulfilled them in Himself for us. For if He had been subject to them naturally, they would have been performed by Him necessarily as by every man, and then His victory over these things would have been for Himself and not for us. By His will, therefore, was He subject to them, not as by excess or defect, or as ruled by necessity, or as impelled by the motion of concupiscence, or as a sufferer, or as mortal by nature, but as being above all these things by nature » (1).

From these passages it seems clear that Philoxenus regards the infirmities, sufferings and death of Christ simply as voluntary, not only in their assumption, but also in the way they were supported. He does not consider the humanity of Christ as passible naturally. In this he departs from the common doctrine according to which the sufferings of Christ were both voluntary and natural, that is, voluntarily assumed and naturally supported. They were voluntary because the Son of God consented to forego the preternatural gifts of immortality and impassibility which belonged to His innocent body by virtue of the hypostatic union, and because, after having assumed them, He had full control over them, and they were natural because He became like unto us in everything except sin. Hence we see that the doctrine of Philoxenus on this point is not in harmony with his well known belief in the reality of Christ's humanity and its consubstantiality with our human nature. In his teaching we already notice the germs of the heresy of Julian of Halicarnassus who taught, against Severus of Antioch, that Christ was not subject to human passions or exposed to the changes of our corruptible nature (2).

---

(1) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 11 b, col. 1, line 29 — col. 2, line 29.

(2) Julian held that the body of Christ was incorruptible, that it was not subject to the changes of our nature. Severus maintained the con-

Among the infirmities which Christ assumed in the Incarnation Philoxenus appears to include the moral defect of ignorance or liability to error. In the Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal, he says: « He who as God, experiences neither hunger, nor fatigue, nor sleep, nor ignorance; the Same, as man, was hungry and thirsty, ate and drank, was sleepy and slept, and asked questions to learn » (1). Here, he evidently affirms of Christ as man what he denies of him as God. The word ṭeʿā means « to err », and in a transitive sense « to forget » (Cf. PAYNE-SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, sub voce). As Philoxenus denies it of Christ as God, he seems to affirm it of Him as man; the words « He asked questions to learn » confirm this view.

Summing up of the Doctrine of Philoxenus.

27. From the comparison of the errors of Nestorius and of Eutyches with the passages adduced from Philoxenus' works, the following points concerning his doctrine on the Incarnation seem clear:

---

trary. Having been expelled from their sees by Emperor Justin in 519 on account of their Monophysite doctrines and of their opposition to the Council of Chalcedon, they sought refuge in Egypt. There each began to propagate his opinions on the body of Christ. Hence arose the famous disputes about the corruptibility and the incorruptibility of the body of the Lord. The controversy rose to a serious height in Alexandria. The adherents of Severus were called *φθαρτολάτραι*, or worshipers of the corruptible; the followers of Julian were known by the name of *ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται*, or teachers of the incorruptible. The patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy II, although inclining to the creed of Severus, tried to conciliate both parties and to remain in communion with them. After his death (536), each party chose its own patriarch. The followers of Severus, having elected Theodosius, called themselves Theodosians; those of Julian elected Gaianus and became known as Gaianites. — Cf. HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. II, p. 573; NEALE, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, vol. II, p. 30; PETAVIUS, *Dogmata Theologica*, *De Incarn.*, lib. I, cap. XVI, num. XI-XIII.

(1) P. 108.

a) Against the Nestorians, he acknowledges only one person in Christ.

b) With the Eutychians and against the Council of Chalcedon, he admits only one nature after the union.

c) This nature is a composite one, consisting of the divinity and of the humanity,

d) united without change, mixture or confusion,

e) after the manner of the soul and the body in man.

f) The humanity of Christ, although real and consubstantial with ours, is not a nature, nor a person.

g) The divinity and the humanity constitute in Christ one nature, which Philoxenus calls « One embodied nature of God the Word ».

h) The expression « The Immortal died » means that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, and not in so far as He is God; so that the Trisagion, with the addition introduced by Peter the Fuller, is to be referred to Christ alone, and not to the other two persons of the Holy Trinity.

i) Christ suffered by His will, which means not only that He assumed suffering voluntarily, but also that He was not passible and mortal by nature.

Philoxenus and Original Sin.

28. In speaking of the death of Christ in his Letter to the Monks of Teleda, Philoxenus gives us incidently his doctrine on original sin. He acknowledges its existence, its effects — privation of original justice, concupiscence, and death —, and its transmission into all those born according to the ordinary laws of nature. « On account of the transgression of the first precept, death reigned, and this death is naturally mixed with concupiscence. Therefore every one who comes into this world by way of intercourse, is born naturally mortal; and whether he sins or not, whether he sins little or much, he is in any case subject

to death, because death is mixed in with his nature » (1). And in the same letter, he states clearly that death and concupiscence are in us through ordinary generation: « God then, when He wished to become man of the Virgin in order to create us anew by His becoming, was not incarnate and born from intercourse, as in the old law, so that even in His Incarnation He might be above death and concupiscence, for in every man these two things follow only from intercourse. Of Him, therefore, neither of these is said, because He was conceived and begotten without intercourse. Therefore, the Holy Ghost came to the Virgin, that the Incarnation of the Word might take place of her in a holy manner » (2).

Philoxenus and the Blessed Virgin.

29. That Philoxenus believed in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin is very probable, not only because it was a common doctrine in the Syriac Church in his time (3), but also on account of the allusions to it which we find in his writings. He calls Mary « the pure Virgin » in the Letter to the Monks: « He (the Word) came down and dwelt in the pure Virgin who was sanctified by God the Spirit, and He became man of her without change, in everything like unto us except sin » (4). He also acknowledges in an explicit manner her virginity *ante partum et in partu.* Thus, in the Letter to the Monks of Teleda, he says: « Therefore, He (Christ) is also above death naturally, because His Incarnation took place in a holy manner without intercourse, without the concupiscence of sin and death » (5). And

(1) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 11a, col. 1, line 26 - col. 2, line 7.
(2) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 11a, col. 2, lines 8-30.
(3) Apud Syros praecipue, forsitan magis dilucida et frequens quam in aliis ecclesiis occurrit perfectae ἀναμαρτησίας et integrae puritatis Dei Genitricis assertio. Abbeloos, *Vita S. Jacobi Sarugensis,* p. 187.
(4) P. 96.
(5) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 11b, col. 1, line 29 col. 2 - line 1.

again, in the same letter: « Also all those who are born, are not born in a virginal manner; He (Christ), on the contrary, was born of the Virgin who, in His birth, preserved the signs of her virginity » (1).

B

His Doctrine on the Trinity.

Three Persons and one Nature.

30. When he treats of the Blessed Trinity, Philoxenus, like the other Monophysites of his day, preserves the distinction between nature and person, which he does not admit in the mystery of the Incarnation. He confesses clearly one God in three divine persons. Thus, in the Letter to the Monks, he writes: « This Jesus, God the Word, is our truth, with His Father and with His Holy Spirit: one Trinity, one essence, one divinity, one nature from everlasting and from eternity. For there is not in Him (God) nature and nature, nor essence and essence, nor anything recent or old, but One in Three and Three in One; an eternal nature and eternal persons, one essence adored with its persons from everlasting and from eternity » (2). In the Letter to the Monks of Teleda, speaking of the faith for which we must be ready to die, he says: « Thus I believe and confess one substantial and eternal nature of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: the Father, Who is really Father, because of His Son Who is from Him; the Son, Who is Son in truth, because He is consubstantial with the Father; and the Holy Ghost, Who proceeds from the Father and is glorified with the Son; one God,

(1) Guidi, ibid., fol. 17b, col. 1, lines 23-26.
(2) P. 96.

because there is one nature; three persons, because they are so » ([1]). And again: « In this one divine nature with its three holy persons I have learned to believe » ([2]).

Equality and Consubstantiality of the Persons.

31. Philoxenus also teaches the equality and consubstantiality of the three divine persons. In the Letter to the Monks, he calls the Son the Splendor and the essential Image of the Father: « By the will of the essence, this same Person (the Word) came down from heaven, that is, God from God, natural Son of a natural Father, the Splendor of the Father and His essential Image, God the Word Who is over all » ([3]). In the Letter to the Monks of Beth-Gaugal, he calls Christ the equal of God: « He who does not confess that God emptied Himself, and took the likeness of a servant, as Paul teaches, does not know that Christ is the equal of God » ([4]). He acknowledges in explicit terms that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, as is clear from the opening sentence of the Letter to Zeno: « O Christ-loving Zeno, Emperor, concerning the embodiment and the humanifying of God the Word, Who is consubstantial with God the Father, and was begotten by Him before ages and worlds, Who is always God and near God, Who is God the Word, because He was begotten by Him without passion and, with Him, is not subject to time, we have learned, we believe, and we have received from tradition (as follows): that He (God the Word) emptied Himself and came into the womb of the Virgin, without leaving the Father, without

(1) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 4a, col. 2, line 22 - fol. 4b, col. 1, line 5.
(2) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 4b, col. 1, lines 26-29.
(3) P. 96. Cf. *Hebr.* I, 3.
(4) P. 110.

separating Himself from Him with Whom, near Whom, and like unto Whom He always is » (1).

That the testimonies as to the equality and consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost are not so numerous, is accounted for by the fact that, in his letters, Philoxenus treats mainly of the Incarnation. Still the few passages in which he speaks of the Holy Ghost leave no doubt as to his belief on this point. In the Letter to Zeno, he says that the Son is consubstantial with the Father and with the Holy Ghost: « The person of the Son, therefore, became embodied by the will of the Father and of the Holy Ghost, and this embodiment daes not exclude that He may be consubstantial with them, for He was begotten Son (by the Father) and He was born Son (of the Virgin) » (2). And, in the same letter, he attributes to the Holy Ghost as well as to the Father the power of raising Christ from the dead: « The Holy Ghost also raised Him, for (Paul says again): He (Christ) was known to be the Son of God by power, and by the Holy Ghost according to the resurrection from the dead » (3).

Eternal Generation of the Son.

32. The eternal generation of the Son is often spoken of in Philoxenus' writings especially in connection with His temporal generation from the Virgin. In the Letter to the Monks, we read: « And He, Whose generation from the Father is without beginning, was brought forth with a beginning in His generation from the Virgin » (4). And in the Letter to Zeno: « She (the Virgin) did not bring Him forth spiritually since (the Word) has His spiritual generation from the Father, and He did not

(1) P. 118.
(2) P. 121.
(3) P. 124.
(4) P. 98.

become (man), as He was begotten by the Father, according to the order of the (divine) nature and of the essential generation » [1].

Procession of the Holy Ghost.

33. That Philoxenus believed in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father is evident from the passage adduced above: « And the Holy Ghost, Who proceeds from the Father and is glorified with the Son » [2]. This, in fact, was the expression generally used in speaking of the procession of the Holy Ghost, before the insertion of the *Filioque* into the Creed [3]. Not only does Philoxenus affirm that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, but he considers the procession of the Holy Ghost different from that of the Son, which is called generation. In the Letter to Zeno, giving a reason why the Father and the Holy Ghost did not become incarnate, he says: « The Father had no corporal generation, because He is always Father; nor had the Holy Ghost, because He did not come from the Father *as Son* in order to become the Son of the Virgin » [4].

But does Philoxenus also teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son? Assemani denies it on the strength of the following passage in Philoxenus' treatise *De Trinitate et Incarnatione*: « Not indeed as the Son is from the Father is also the Holy Ghost from the Son, but both are from the Father: the Father is Being only; the Son, Son of the Being; the Holy Ghost is from the Being » [5]. Here, however, Philoxenus does

---

(1) P. 119.
(2) P. 71.
(3) The definition of the Council of Constantinople (381) runs thus: *(Πιστεύομεν) καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.* Hefele, op. cit., vol. II, p. 11.
(4) P. 121.
(5) *B. O.*, II, p. 20.

not deny absolutely that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, but seems to imply that He does not proceed from the Son in the same way as the Son proceeds from the Father, that is, by way of generation. As a matter of fact, Assemani is obliged to admit that Philoxenus contradicts himself in this passage, and goes against the principles he gives in the same treatise regarding the distinction of the three divine persons. The principle is this: « The Father is distinguished from the Son by this only that He is Begetter unbegotten; the Son is distinguished from the Father by this that He is begotten, not begetter; and the Holy Ghost is distinguished from the Father and from the Son by this that He is always Holy Ghost, and never Father and never Son » (1). Hence, argues Assemani, if the Son is distinguished by this only that He is begotten, not begetter, it follows manifestly that He has everything that the Father possesses, except the power of generating; and, consequently, the power of producing the Holy Ghost is common to Him with the Father (2).

There is no need, however, of making Philoxenus contradict himself, for, if we turn to his Letter to the Monks of Teleda, we find a remarkable testimony concerning his belief in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. In this letter, after declaring his faith in the Blessed Trinity, he adds: « One God, because there is one nature; three persons because they are so; the Father Who is Father from everlasting and from eternity, Who is Father, not by will only, but by nature; the Son Who is essentially Son with the Father, Son, not indeed by grace, but by natural generation; and the Spirit Who is so, not metaphorically nor in time as the other messenger spirits who came into existence, but Holy Spirit, from the nature of (men keyānā) and consubstantial with (bar keyānā) the Father and the Son » (3). Here, Philoxenus asserts that the Holy Ghost is not only *bar*

(1) Ibid., p. 21.
(2) *B. O.*, II, ibid.
(3) Guidi, op. cit., fol. 4b, col. 1, lines 2-21.

keyānā (consubstantial with) the Father and the Son, but that He is also *men keyānā*, that is, that He proceeds from the nature of the Father and of the Son. Hence we see that his teaching on the Holy Ghost is in perfect harmony with that of the Syriac Church. Long before the insertion of the *Filioque* into the Creed, forty bishops from Persia assembled at Seleucia in 410 under the presidency of SS. Isaac and Maruthas, and expressed their belief in the procession of the Holy Ghost in the following canon, which is one of the oldest documents of Syriac literature: « We confess a Living and Holy Spirit, the Living Paraclete Who is from the Father and from the Son, and one Trinity, one essence, one will, embracing the faith of the three hundred and eighteen bishops which was defined in the city of Nice. Such is our confession and our faith, which we have received from our holy Fathers » (1). Such was also the teaching of Jacob of Serugh (2) and other Monophysites.

C

His Doctrine on the Real Presence.

34. As regards the Holy Eucharist, there is no doubt that Philoxenus, like the other Monophysites of his day (3), believed in the

(1) Cf. the article of Lamy, *L'Eglise Syriaque et la procession du St. Esprit* in *La Revue Catholique de Louvain* for March 1860, pp. 166 sqq. The Syriac text of this canon which Lamy published in the above article is:
ܘܡܘܕܝܢ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܚܝܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ: ܦܪܩܠܝܛܐ ܚܝܐ ܕܡܢ
ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ. ܒܚܕ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ. ܒܚܕ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ. ܒܚܕ
ܨܒܝܢܐ. ܟܕ ܫܠܡܝܢ ܠܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܡܐܐ
ܘܬܡܢܬܥܣܪ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ: ܕܗܘܬ ܒܢܝܩܝܐ. ܡܕܝܢܬܐ:
ܕܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ ܗܘܕܝܬܢ ܘܗܝܡܢܘܬܢ: ܗܕܐ ܕܩܒܠܢ ܡܢ
ܐܒܗܝܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ.

(2) Abbeloos, *Vita S. Jacobi Sarugensis*, p. 121.

(3) Renaudot, *Lit. Or. Coll.*, vol. II, p. 507.

real presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. In his Letter to the Monks of Senūn, written a year or so before his death, he refutes the opinion of the Nestorians who held that the body and blood given in Holy Communion were not the body and blood of Christ, but the body and blood of a man whom the Word of God had assumed and united to Himself ([1]). The passage quoted by Assemani is well worth reproducing here, for it is one of the clearest testimonies of the Syriac Church on the dogma of the real presence: « And He (Christ) is one Son and one Lord in these two: that is, in so far as He is God, and in so far as He became man. He remained one after He became man, as He was one before His Incarnation, except that formerly (before the Incarnation) He was one without flesh, but now (after the Incarnation) He is one having a body. For the flesh which He took from us belongs to Him, and not to a man considered distinct from Himself. And, therefore, we confess that we receive the living body of the Living God, and not the mere, simple body of a mortal man; likewise, we receive the living blood of the Living One in the sacred draughts (of Communion), and not the mere blood of a corruptible man like ourselves. For it was not sanctified bread that He called " His body "; nor was it wine enriched only by a blessing that He called " His blood ". But He said of them that they were truly His own body and blood, as it is written: " Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke: and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat: This is My body, which shall be broken for you unto remission of sins. Likewise, taking the chalice, He gave thanks, and said: Take ye, and drink of this: This is My blood which shall be shed for you unto remission of sins ". Thus He called the bread " body " and the wine " blood ", not indeed (the body and blood) of another man, but His own » ([2]).

([1]) *B. O.*, III, pars 2a, p. 290.
([2]) *B. O.*, II, pp. 38, 39.

It is clear that Philoxenus acknowledges here the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the dogma of transubstantiation. In this he agrees with the Jacobites as is plain from the liturgies which have come down to us ([1]).

Concerning the reception of Holy Communion, we find a very interesting passage in Philoxenus' Letter to the Monks. Speaking of the Word made man, he says: « Invisible, we see Him; not tangible, we handle Him; not capable of being eaten we eat Him; not capable of being tasted, we drink Him; we embrace Him Who is all powerful; we kiss Him Who is infinite » ([2]). Here, we have not only an explicit proof of his belief in the real presence, « we eat Him, we drink Him », but probably also an allusion to the special acts of devotion which, in the early ages of the Church, often accompanied the reception of the Holy Eucharist. We know that, in the times of persecution, the faithful used to receive the Blessed Sacrament in their hand ([3]), from the priest ([4]), and carry it home where they could communicate themselves. Even after the days of persecution, the custom continued for a long time. St. John Damascene tells us that, in Jerusalem, the faithful, after receiving the Blessed Sacrament in their hand, carried it to their eyes, lips, and forehead, to sanctify themselves ([5]). This custom obtained among the Syrians in the days of Aphraates, for he says in his seventh Demonstration: « They love Our Lord, and they lick His wounds when they receive His body, and place it over their eyes, and lick it with their tongue, as the dog licks

---

([1]) Renaudot, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 449, 494.

([2]) P. 101.

([3]) Tertullian, *De Idolatria,* cap. VII, in Migne, *P. L.*, vol. I, p. 669.

([4]) Tertullian, *Liber de Corona,* cap. III, in Migne, *P. L.*, vol. II, p. 79.

([5]) *De Fide orthodoxa,* lib. IV, cap. 13, in Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 94, p. 1149.

his master » [1]. It is probably to the same custom that Philoxenus refers when he says in the passage quoted above: « We embrace Him Who is all powerful; we kiss Him Who is infinite ».

---

(1) *Demonstration* VII, n.° 21, in Graffin's *Patrologia Syriaca*, vol. I, p. 349. Cf. review of the same by Hyvernat in *The Catholic University Bulletin* for April 1895, pp. 314-319.

PART SECOND.

CHAPTER I.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPTS.

35. The three letters which are published here are extant in Syr. Mss. 135, 136, and 138 of the Vatican library. The Letter to Zeno is extant only in Ms. 135 (fol. 17r-19v); the first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal exists only in this same Ms. (fol. 19v-23v); the Letter to the Monks is found in Ms. 135 (fol. 15v-17r), in Ms. 136 (fol. 29v-35r), in Ms. 138 (fol. 120r-123r), and in Syr. Ms. Add. 12164 of the British Museum (fol. 126a-130a). The following is a brief description of these different Manuscripts.

Ms. 135 (according to the old catalogue Codex Syr. XI of Assemani) consists of 102 vellum leaves, 26 by 18 ctm., and is written in the Estrangelo character. Folios 1-12 have one column each; the others have two. The columns are ordinarily of 37 lines. The Ms. is not all of the same hand. It bears no date; Guidi assigns it to the seventh or eighth century (1).

(1) From a private communication dated *Rome, January 17, 1902.*

Ms. 136 (Codex Nitriensis XXVII of the old catalogue) belongs to the sixth century. It consists of 130 vellum leaves, 25 by 16 ctm., and has two columns to a page. It is written in the Estrangelo character.

Ms. 138 (Codex Nitriensis XXVI of the old catalogue) contains 136 vellum leaves, 31 by 25 ctm., and has three columns to a page. It is written in the Estrangelo character and bears the date 581.

Syr. Ms. Add. 12164 of the British Museum, written in a beautiful Edessene hand of the sixth century, consists of 141 vellum leaves about 31 by 25 centimeters. Each page is divided into three columns of from 37 to 44 lines (Cf. Wright, *Cat. Syr. Mss.*, p. 527).

CHAPTER II.

INTRODUCTION TO THE THREE LETTERS.

A.

The Letter to the Monks.

36. The Syriac text of this letter is given as it stands in Ms. 138, together with the variant readings from Mss. 135 and 136. These three Mss. are referred to in the notes as A, B, C, respectively. In Add. 12164 of the B. M., the text of the Letter to the Monks presents but few unimportant variant readings which have been omitted in this edition.

Title. Assemani (¹) takes this letter for a second letter to the Monks of Teleda. As Guidi remarks (²), however, there is no indication of the fact in the above Mss., and it is not known to whom it was sent. Assemani himself, in another place (³), calls it simply « The Letter to the Monks ». The four Mss. which contain it give each a different title, without any reference to the Monks of Teleda. The title in Ms. 138 is:

ܐܓ[ܪܬܐ ܕܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ] ܕܐܬܟܬܒܬ ܡܢܗ ܠܘܬ ܕܝܪ̈ܝܐ

In Ms. 136, the title is: ܬܘܒ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܐܬܪ̈ܬܡ ܕܠܗ ܕܡܪܝ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ.

Ms. 135 gives it as a letter to the monks on the subject of faith: ܥܠ ܫܠܡܗ ܕܡܪܝܢܘܣ ܡܥܢܝܐ: ܡܪܝܢ ܠܡܚܒܬ

(¹) *B. O.*, II, p. 37.
(²) *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 35, p. 143, note 1.
(³) *B. O.*, II, p. 28.

ܟܬܒܐ ܕܚܡܫܐ ܕܠܟܠܗܘܢ. ܘܡܕܡܟܐܬ ܕܝܢ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܡܕܝܢܐ
ܡܢ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ: ܕܠܘܬ ܕܝܪܝܐ: ܡܛܠ ܫܪܒܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ.

The Ms. Add. 12164 gives simply: ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܬܟܬܒܬ ܡܢܗ ܠܘܬ ܕܝܪܝܐ.

It seems probable that this letter was not directed to any particular monastery, but was meant for circulation among the monks of many convents, as we may infer from the opening sentence: « To the holy, pure, and faithful convents, healthy members of the body of the truth of Christ God Who is over all; zealous supporters of orthodoxy, ye who heal the breaches of error which false doctrines have made in the body of faith; (to) ye all whom I have seen in body and in spirit, holy monasteries. It is good and fitting for the truth to be declared openly, because truth is like unto light in thet ype of its manifestation which is for all ». This would justify the name *Letter to the Monks* by which it is known in the Mss.

Date. Assemani, regarding this letter as a second letter to the Monks of Teleda, naturally places the date of its composition during the exile of Philoxenus (519-523), and he bases his opinion on the following passage: « I heard that, after I had gone from you, they circulated false reports about me, calling me a deceiver and corruptor » (1). This, however, merely shows that all the monks of these monasteries did not share the views of Philoxenus; as a matter of fact, this very letter made him another enemy against whom he wrote his famous treatise « How One Person of the Holy Trinity became incarnate and suffered for us » (2).

This letter was evidently written after the year 477, because it contains the Trisagion with the addition « Thou Who wast crucified for us » made at that time by Peter the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch; and it may have been written many years after that for Philoxenus speaks of the Trisagion as being sung

(1) P. 104.
(2) Wright, op. cit., p. 528.

generally in the churches: « But by His nature He is immortal because He is God, as the whole Church of God cries out in the Trisagion: « Thou art Holy, God; Thou art Holy, Strong One; Thou art Holy, Immortal One; (Thou) Who wast crucified for us, have mercy on us » (1).

An approximate date may perhaps be found in the passage in which Philoxenus advises the monks not to confine themselves to the duties of their ascetic calling, but to go out and fight for the truth openly: « I exhort you also to be open defenders and preachers of the truth. Be not afraid of man; do not desist from fighting zealously for the truth, saying: 'We are solicitous for the quiet of our ascetic life'. Ascetic life is beautiful (indeed), and the works of justice are worthy of praise. (But) these (works) are members whose head is truth, and if the head is cut off, the members perish. Let no man say: « I keep my faith to myself »; for thou dost not preserve it in thyself if, seeing it perish in others, thou remainest negligent » (2). We know that Philoxenus often sought the help of Monophysite monks in his struggles against his enemies. According to Evagrius (3), he instigated the monks of Cynegica and those of Syria Prima against Flavian II, when his efforts to deprive the latter of the see of Antioch had failed at the council of Sidon. The present letter may be one of the many that he wrote to enlist the help of the monks who agreed with him. For these different reasons, it seems probable that it was written some time during his fourteen years' struggle with Flavian of Antioch (499-513).

Analysis. As the titles in Ms. 135 and Add. 12164 indicate, and as Philoxenus tells us himself (4), this letter deals with *the question of faith*, not of faith in general as in the Discourses,

(1) P. 101.
(2) P. 104.
(3) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 86 bis, p. 2660.
(4) P. 96.

but of faith relative to the Incarnation. It is divided into three parts: a prologue, a refutation of the Gnostic, Nestorian, and Eutychian theories on the Incarnation, and an epilogue.

After praising the monks for their zeal in the cause of religion, Philoxenus tells them that faith must be preached openly, for truth has been revealed to enlighten every man. It must be announced not only to friends, but also to enemies. If we seek it with ardor and experience how sweet and agreeable it is, nothing can separate us from it.

Philoxenus then goes on to explain what truth is, and he defends his own doctrine on the Incarnation.

a) By becoming man, the Word of God suffered no change.

b) He did not assume the person of a man in whom He dwelt as in a temple.

c) The body which He took did not come down from heaven; nor was it a mere appearance (*φαντασία*).

d) The Word was not incarnate without the rational soul, and He assumed our humanity in and of the Virgin, so that He, Whose generation from the Father is eternal, had a real and temporal generation from the Virgin.

e) We must not, like the Nestorians, divide Christ into two persons or two natures, attributing sufferings to the one and glory to the other; but we must refer both glory and humiliation to the Only Son of God, Who is from two, that is, from the divinity and from the humanity.

f) The Word of God Who became incarnate for our salvation died for us, and the death which He died was suffered by Him and not by a man distinct from Himself, for he who admits a human person along with the Son of God in the mystery of the Incarnation, introduces a fourth person into the Trinity.

In the epilogue, Philoxenus advises the monks not to be satisfied with the duties of contemplative life, but to fight courageously for the faith that is in them; he asks for their prayers,

and he anathematizes Nestorius and Eutyches and all those who agree with them.

B.

The First(1) Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal.

37. This letter is extant only in the Syr. Ms. 135 of the Vatican (fol. 19 v-23 v). The title, according to the catalogue, is: ܬܘܒ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܗܘ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܡܪܝ، ܐܦܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܒܝܬ ܓܘܓܠ ܕܝܪܝܐ ܢܟܦܐ.

Date. The first letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal (2) was evidently written before 491, for Zeno is mentioned as being in actual possession of the throne: « Moreover, the faithful and just Emperor Zeno and the archbishop of the capital return you thanks for the anaphoras which you have sent » (3).

There is another indication, however, which determines approximately the date of composition of this letter. After praising the monks for their zeal on behalf of the faith, Philoxenus adds: « And the same Christ-loving (Emperor) has openly declared that he gained the victory over his enemies with (the help of) your prayers, and he is ready to give us ample reward for the work which we have undertaken for the peace of the churches, and to drive away from them the enemies of the Cross » (4).

---

(1) Following Assemani (*B. O.*, II, p. 35), we have called this letter « the first Letter to the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal ». The other letter to these monks is found in Ms. 136, which is the Codex Nitriensis XXVII of Assemani (*B. O.*, I, p. 569).

(2) According to Sozomen, our only authority on this matter, Gaugal is a mountain near Diarbekir. It is perhaps identical with the Karadja-Dagh, a little to the southwest of Diarbekir.

(3) P. 115.

(4) P. 115.

The enemies referred to here are not only Basiliscus, the usurper (476-477), but especially Leontius and Illus, whose rebellion lasted nearly three years (1), and who were not defeated till the early part of the year 485 (2). By the enemies of the Cross, Philoxenus understands, as usual, the Nestorian bishops, and also all those who accepted the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon and refused to sign the Henoticon. We know from Theophanes that in 485 many Catholic bishops were banished from their sees by Zeno and Acacius, under pretext of having assisted the rebels (Leontius and Illus), but in reality for refusing to sign the Henoticon and to communicate with the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria (3).

This wholesale deposition of bishops had not taken place when the letter was written, for Philoxenus says that Zeno is ready to drive away from the churches the enemies of the Cross. The patriarch of Antioch, Calandion, who was one of the first victims of this persecution, must have been deprived of his see about the middle of the year 485, for a council was held in Rome on the fifth of October of that year over the question of his deposition (4). Hence it seems very probable that this letter was written some time between the fall of Leontius and Illus, and the deposition of Calandion, perhaps in the spring of 485.

Analysis. This letter, like the preceding, consists of three parts: a prologue, a defence of his own doctrine, and an epilogue.

Philoxenus writes to confirm the glad tidings already proclaimed in the churches (probably the promulgation of the Henoticon and the overthrow of the rebels). He praises the holiness of the monks, the purity of their life, and the rigor of

---

(1) Brooks, *The Chronological Canon of James of Edessa*, in the *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 53, p. 317; also Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs*, vol. VI, p. 516.

(2) Cf. Tillemont, ibid.

(3) Migne, *P. G.*, vol. 108, p. 325.

(4) Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. XVI, p. 366.

their rule. They serve Christ for Christ's sake, and not for temporal gifts.

After stating his own doctrine, Philoxenus defends it against Nestorius and Eutyches.

a) The Son of God became man and remained as He is, God.

b) He did not receive any glory from the body that He took, but by His Incarnation He gave glory to our nature.

c) He was incarnate of the Virgin without change.

d) Both the divine and the human acts are to be referred to one Christ, and not to two persons or to two natures.

e) Christ suffered by His will, and the death of the Cross was undergone not by a man in whom the Word dwelt, but by the Word Himself Who became man and Who, in His death, did not lose the life of His nature.

f) Then follow a number of sentences which remind one of the canons or anathemas of a council. In them Philoxenus sets forth at length his views on the person of Christ and rejects the Nestorian opinions. Many of these sentences contain some plays on words which give additional force to the expression. Thus (p. 111) we read: « He who attributes *number* (menyānā) to the one Christ, and counts in Him two persons or distinguishes two sons, such a one is not a member of Christ, and has not been *numbered* (lā'ethmᵉni) among the host of the chosen ones of God ». And, in the next sentence, Philoxenus says: « He who does not confess that He, Whom John called " the Word ", is the very Same of Whom Matthew *wrote* (kᵉthabh) " Son of David and Son of Abraham ", such a one has not been *written* (lā 'ethkᵉthebh) in (the book) of the adoption of the Heavenly Father ».

In the epilogue, Philoxenus exhorts the monks to fight against godless doctrines, and he bitterly denounces his enemies.

C.

The Letter to Zeno.

38. The Letter to Emperor Zeno on the Incarnation of the Son of God is extant only in the Vatican Syr. Ms. 135 (fol. 17 r-19 v). The title is: ܬܘܒ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܡܪܝ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܙܝܢܘܢ ܡܠܟܐ .

According to Assemani (1), Philoxenus wrote this letter shortly after his consecration as bishop of Mabbôgh, when he accepted the Henoticon. But this was not the only event that called forth this interesting document. From the last sentence of the letter it would appear that the faith of Philoxenus had been attacked, or that representations had been made to the Emperor for appointing to an important metropolitan see a man who had caused much trouble in Antioch, and whose name was « synonymous with turmoil and strife » (2). It was then that Zeno demanded of him an exposition of his doctrine, so that Philoxenus gives us in the present letter his own profession of faith in the Incarnation, written in obedience to the Emperor's orders and in answer to his opponents: « I have written these few lines, O pious Emperor, and have sent them to Your Christianity, because you have ordered it, to confound the heretics who question my faith in Christ, and also to edify those who think as I do, and who, made bold by divine love, try to defend me » (3).

What were the exact charges brought against Philoxenus by his enemies is not certain. From the contents of the letter

(1) *B. O.*, II, p. 34.
(2) Budge, op. cit., vol. II, p. x.
(3) P. 126.

it seems probable that he had been accused of Eutychianism or Apollinarism, for he lays emphasis on the fact that he is writing about the embodiment (methgašš^{e}mānūthā) and the humanifying (methbarn^{e}šānūthā) of the Son of God. Although these two words are often loosely translated by « Incarnation », they are not at all synonymous, and the difference of meaning between them ought to be borne in mind, especially when studying the christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries. The Apollinarists, adopting the trichotomy of Plato, taught that the Word of God assumed in the Incarnation the human flesh (*σάρξ*), and the animal soul (*ψυχή*), but not the rational soul (*νοῦς*); in other words, they admitted the *σάρκωσις* (methgašš^{e}mānūthā), but rejected the *ἐνανθρώπησις* (methbarn^{e}šānūthā) (¹). It is probably to clear himself of some like charge that Philoxenus makes use of those two words here. And it is also worthy of notice that the word « ethbarnaš » (he was made man), which does not occur in the preceding letters, is found no less than three times in this one, and in places where Philoxenus generally employs the more common term « h^{e}wā barnāšā » (he became man).

Analysis. *a*) The Word of God, the consubstantial Son of the Father, was incarnate in and of the Virgin.

b) His humanity was real, otherwise He could not have redeemed us.

c) His becoming man, like His essence, was without change, for change belongs only to things created.

d) He did not create in the Virgin a man whom He afterwards assumed, but He is true God and true man.

e) Of the Son of God Philoxenus confesses two generations but not two natures, for he argues that, if we admit two natures, we must necessarily admit two persons and two sons.

(¹) Cf. Petavius, *Dogmata Theologica, De Incar.*, lib. II, cap. I n.° x.

f) Christ died on the Cross without losing the life of His essence, and by His death He destroyed the power of death over all the children of men.

g) Finally, Philoxenus anathematizes Nestorius for admitting in one and the same Christ a distinction of persons and of natures, attributing the miracles to God and the sufferings to a man in whom God dwelt; he also says anathema to Eutyches for doing away with the Incarnation of the Word of God by denying the reality of the body which He assumed.

CHAPTER III.

TRANSLATION (1).

A.

[Letter of Mār Aks^{e}nāyā] which was written by him to the Monks (2). 127

To the holy, pure, and faithful convents, healthy members of
the body of the truth of Christ God Who is over all; zealous sup-
porters of orthodoxy (3), ye who heal the breaches of error || which 128
false doctrines have made in the body of faith; (to) ye all
whom I have seen in body and in spirit, holy monasteries (4):

It is good and fitting for the truth to be declared openly, because truth is like unto light in the type of its manifestation which is for all. For, as light has been made to shine on every thing so also truth has been revealed in the world to enlighten every man, according to the words of Him Who is Truth, and Who has given the truth: « That which I tell

---

(1) The numbers in the margin refer to the pages of the Syriac text, the sign || indicating where the page of the text begins. The translation has been made as literal as possible; the words added to bring out more clearly the meaning of the text are placed between brackets.

(2) The title in B (Vat. Syr. Ms. 135) is: By the power of Our Lord Jesus Christ, we begin to write a compilation of works of all kinds. First, the letter of the Saint Mār Aks^{e}nāyā to the monks on the subject of faith.

The title in C (Vat. Syr. Ms. 136) is: Again, the second letter of Mār Aks^{e}nāyā.

(3) The word orthodoxy here is synonymous with Monophysitism.

(4) B and C add: I, Aks^{e}nāyā, a disciple of you all and an humble member, yet found worthy of your divine truth, (wish you) abundant peace in the Lord our hope.

I tell you in the dark, speak ye in the light; and that which you hear in your ears, preach ye upon the house-tops » [1]. And, to teach us that we must not only preach the truth in simple words to our friends, but that we must declare it also before enemies, with that confidence that fights with death, He said to us: « And fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul » [2]. And again, in the public confession before persecutors, He exhorts and urges us by His promises to declare the faith which He has delivered unto us, saying: « Every one that shall confess Me before men, I will also confess him before My Father Who is in heaven, and before His angels; but he that
129 shall deny Me, I will also deny him before the Father || and before the angels » [3].

Such is the openness, therefore, with which Jesus Our God commands us to declare our truth, and not to be ashamed, and not to blush, and not to be acceptors of persons in authority, and not to seek to please those men who are the adversaries of truth; for he who wishes to please men cannot be a servant of Christ. But as for him who has experienced the love of Christ, and tasted the sweetness of truth, nothing shall ever be able to diminish the ardor of his pursuit in search of the truth which he loves. For truth is agreeable and sweet above all things; and it inflames every soul, that has tasted it rightly, to seek after it. Like the divine Apostles and the holy Martyrs, every one who has experienced this pleasure seeks it with an unspeakable ardor. Nothing was able to diminish the ardor of their love in the pursuit of truth: neither fire, nor beasts, nor swords, nor the combs (of executioners), nor exile from country to country, nor close confinement in dungeons, nor the insults of enemies, nor calumnies, nor injustices, nor the inconstancy of friends, nor the

(1) St. Matthew, x, 27.
(2) St. Matthew, x, 28.
(3) St. Matthew, x, 32-33.

defection of acquaintances, nor separation from family, nor the
opposition of the whole world, nor the onslaught of visible and
invisible (enemies), nor anything || above or below, can separate 130
from the love of Christ those who have tasted and perceived the
truth, as St. Paul, in the ardor of this love, speaking for all those
like himself, declared, (saying): « For I am sure that neither
death, nor life, nor powers, nor virtues, nor height, nor depth,
nor things present, nor things to come, shall be able to separate
me from the love of Christ (our) God » (1).

It behooves every one who is a disciple of truth to place
this mirror before his eyes, and to look at it constantly, and he
shall not be cast down by the fear of anything. For in the
truth and love of Christ there is no fear, and he who fears is
not perfect in love. Every thing that is not from truth is
placed outside of truth: whether fear or lying, whether flattery
or respect of persons, love of pleasures or thirst for power. These
and similar things are placed outside of truth; and, as these
things cannot be in truth, those who are enslaved by them cannot
remain in truth nor possess faith. For they are those || whose 131
god is their belly (2) which has become to them the master of their
lives; wherever they find its pleasures and desires, there they
turn; they so identify themselves with it that they remain slaves
to their shame, and never give up the pleasures of the flesh.

But as for us, O dear (brethren), athletes in the spiritual warfare, it is not becoming for us to deal thus with truth, which is our life; but (it behooves us) to renounce whatever is outside of it, and to confess that in it alone are our light and our joy, our wealth and our priceless treasure, and the breath of our spiritual life.

Now, because it is necessary to make known the cause of my discourse, what it is about, and the reason for which it was

(1) Romans, viii, 38-39.
(2) Philippians, iii, 19. C adds « And whose glory is in their shame ».

written, I state clearly the scope of my discourse. Briefly, I (intend to) demonstrate in writing the truth of the faith which I have learned from the Holy Books and from the interpreters of the Church, my masters, for the joy and consolation of those who love me in truth and for truth's sake, and for the shame and confusion of heretics, disciples of the demons, who calumniate me and call me a deceiver, and insult in me the truth which I have learned
132 and which I preach. For, since they call truth error, || these liars give the name of deceivers to the heralds of truth.

Who then or what is truth, if not Jesus Christ, the God Who is over all, He Who said, « I am the Truth, and the Light, and the Life » (1). This Jesus, God the Word, is our truth, with His Father and with His Holy Spirit: one Trinity, one essence, one divinity, one nature from everlasting and from eternity. For there is not in Him (God) nature and nature, nor essence and essence, nor anything recent or old, but One in Three and Three in One; an eternal nature and eternal persons, one essence adored with its persons from everlasting and from eternity.

One of the persons of this essence is the Mediator of our Confession (2), Truth from Truth, Light from Light, Living from the Living One, and Immortal from Him Who does not die. By the will of the essence (3), this same person came down from heaven, that is, God from God, natural Son of a natural Father, the Splendor of the Father and His essential Image, God the Word Who is over all. He came down and dwelt in the pure Virgin who was sanctified by God the Spirit, and He became
133 man of her without change, in everything like unto us || except sin, there having been neither change, nor variation, nor confusion in His nature, as God Himself said by the Prophet, « I am,

---

(1) St. John, xiv, 6,
(2) B has « The Mediator of the divinity ».
(3) B has « By the will of the divinity ».

and I change not » [1]. For He Who was not made is not mutable; He Who was not created cannot change. Therefore He became man without change; He was embodied, and remained as He is, spiritual.

He did not cause the person of a man to adhere to Himself that two might be counted in Him, He and a man adhering to Him. Nor did He enter and dwell in another, He Who is the Only Son, but He was embodied from our nature and He is not counted two. He became man of the Virgin, and His person was not doubled; He became (man), and He was not changed, because even in His becoming His essence remained without change. For as He is in His essence, so He remained also in His becoming, that is, without change.

The Ancient of days became a child; the Most High became an infant in the womb, and God became man in the womb. The Spiritual One became corporal; the Invisible One was seen; the Intangible One was handled; He Who is consubstantial with the Father became of us in His becoming, because He, God the Word, was embodied in the Virgin and of the Virgin. He did not bring His body down from heaven, as Bardesanes said; nor was He seen under a false appearance or a phantom, according to || the blasphemy of Mani and Marcion; nor was (His 134
body) made from nothing, as said Eutyches the fool; nor was His nature changed, as the wicked Arius and Eunomius imagine; nor was He, Who was embodied, without (human) intelligence, according to the blasphemous doctrine of Apollinaris; but He Who is perfect God took a body, and became perfect man of the Virgin.

The Word was not embodied in the Virgin, as if not also of the Virgin, but He truly became man *in* her and *of* her. For the Virgin was not indeed a channel (through which) God

(1) Malachias, iii, 6.

(passed), but (His) true Mother, because He became man of her. Nor again was God born in another man, for a man was not born in whom God dwelt, according to the teaching of the impious Nestorius and his mad disciples; but God, Who was embodied without change, was born of the Virgin. For He, Who descended into her as God, the very Same came forth from her as man; and the one Whom she conceived spiritually, the very Same she brought forth corporally. And He, Whose generation from the Father is without beginning, was brought forth with a beginning in His generation from the Virgin.

(Being) of a supernatural nature, He became man; (being)
135 of a supernatural nature, || He was born of a creature; (being) of a supernatural nature, He sucked milk; (being) of a supernatural nature, He grew in stature. Let us beware of the impiety of those who say that the Virgin (1) brought forth God and a man; who divide and count two in Him Who is the Only Son of God, Who is from two, from the divinity and from the humanity; (of the impiety of those) who divide (Christ), and in this one God Who was embodied, attribute humiliation to the one and glory to the other, power to the one and weakness to the other.

Thus, indeed, do these dishonest (men) speak: « One was born, and the other was not born; one sucked and the other did not suck; one was circumcised and the other was not; one grew and the other did not; one (2) ate and the other did not; one drank and the other did not; one fasted and the other did not; one (3) was hungry and the other was not; one slept and the other did not; one suffered and the other did not; one died and the other did not; and (so these) dishonest men divide unto one and another all these words which are spoken of Christ, as if one was born truly and the other in deception, as if one suffered

(1) B has « Mary ».
(2) B omits all as far as « one fasted ».
(3) B omits all as far as « one slept ».

in fact and the other || in name, and as if one died in reality 136
and the other in fraud.

But it is not at all in the sense that a man or a body distinct (1) from God died, that death is spoken of God, as it is not in the sense that a man or the body of (2) another person distinct from God was born, that birth is spoken of God; for, it was not a body that was born, but it was God, Who became a body, and (3) remained in His nature God; and it was not a body that was crucified, but it was God, Who became man, and (4) in His death did not lose His life. Not one with another was born; but one God Who was embodied was born. There were not two at the birth, nor two on the Cross; but one was born, and the Same one was crucified. And as of the Virgin, not one in another, nor one with another was born, but one God became man of her without change and the Same is one in His divinity and His humanity; so also on the Cross one was suspended and not two.

Therefore, that God was born of the Virgin, the Church of God believes; (that) God was crucified for all, the truth of the Holy Books declares. Christ is the Son, and the Son is God,
|| and God is the Word, and the Word is consubstantial (with 137
God). If it is written that Christ was crucified, it is God Who was crucified. Christ died and He also rose. Not one was the Christ Who died, and another the God Who did not die; not one was the Only Son Who was given for the redemption of the world, and another the Word Who was not given; not one was the Son Who suffered and died, and another Who remained without suffering. It is written, « God so loved the world as to give His Only Begotten Son for it » (5). This Only Son Who

(1) BC omit « distinct from God ».
(2) BC omit « of another person distinct from God ».
(3) BC omit « and remained in His nature God ».
(4) BC omit « and in His death did not lose His life ».
(5) St. John, III, 16.

was given to death for the redemption of the world, is He of Whom it is said, « The World was made flesh, and dwelt among us » [1]. Again, Paul said, « God was reconciled with us by the death of His Son » [2]. And again he said, « Verily He did not spare His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all » [3]. This Son, by Whose death He (God) was reconciled with us and Whom He delivered to suffering for us, is no other than God the Son Who was begotten of God the Father. Therefore, whether the Holy Books say that Christ, or the Son, or the Only Begotten, or Jesus was born and died, it is God Who was born and died, and not another distinct from Him. For we do not
138 acknowledge || a Son Who is not God, nor a God Who is not Christ.

Be not troubled, therefore, O hearer, at this (statement) that God was crucified for us. For, if God was born of the Virgin, God was also suspended on the Cross. And if a heretic should say, « How can God die? », ask him in return, « How can God be born? » If then He was born of the Woman [4], although He is from the Father in His first generation, He also tasted death of His own will, although He is living in His nature. And as, when He became man, He remained God as He is, without change, so also, when He tasted death for us, He did not lose the life of His nature. For it is God Who became man for us, and it is the Living One Who tasted death for our sake. Let them not deceive thee, O faithful (hearer), by words fraught with fatal discord, as they say to thee, « How can God die? » When thou hearest this from them, return them the answer, « How can God be born? » If, being (already) born,

---

(1) St. John, i, 14.
(2) Romans, v, 10.
(3) Romans, viii, 32.
(4) B has « If then God was born of the Virgin ».

He was born; if existing, He became (man), therefore also, being living, He died of His own will (1).

It was not indeed a mortal or a man that died for us; || for 139
every mortal that dies, dies for himself; and every sufferer that suffers, suffers for himself; and every thing that, not existing, comes into existence, comes into existence for itself. Herein then is a great mystery of profound love and of ineffable salvation, that He Who is became, not that He might be, since He is, but that we, through His becoming (Incarnation), might become the sons of God. Everything that He became, He became, not for Himself, but for us. For He was not a sufferer by His nature, because, if He had suffered being a sufferer (by nature), He would have suffered for Himself. Nor did He become mortal in punishment for the transgression of the (original) precept, as is the case with us, but He is immortal because He is God. (2) Nor did He become immortal by being justified by His works, as the wicked followers of Nestorianism assert; but by His nature He is immortal because He is God, as the whole Church of God cries out in the Trisagion: « Thou art Holy, God; Thou art Holy, Strong One; Thou art Holy Immortal One; (Thou) Who wast crucified for us, have mercy on us ». It is, therefore, this Holy, Strong, Immortal God, Who was crucified for us (3). Thus does
the || true Church believe, thus do the tongues which are moved 140
by truth cry out that He, Who is immortal by nature, God the Word, was crucified in body for all, not that a body or a man distinct from Him was suspended on the Cross.

Invisible (4), we see Him; not tangible, we handle Him; not capable of being eaten, we eat Him; not capable of being tasted, we drink Him; we embrace Him Who is all powerful; we

---

(1) B omits « of His own will ».
(2) B omits all as far as, « as the whole Church, etc. ».
(3) B omits this whole sentence.
(4) C has « Immortal ».

kiss Him Who is infinite. Of Him, Who is immortal, we believe that He died for us; of Him, Who is impassible, we confess that He suffered for us. « We preach unto you that which was from the beginning », said John in his epistle, « that which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled of the Word of life, for the life was manifested. And we have seen, and do bear witness, and declare unto you the life eternal, which was with the Father, and hath been revealed to us » (1).

(2) Thou hearest how this Apostle, who knew the mysteries of Christ, preaches to thee concerning truth, and cries out to thee that the life, which was with the Father, has been revealed; that He Who was invisible has appeared; that He Who was
141 inaudible || has been heard; (3) that He Who was not tangible has been handled; that He Who was silent has conversed. Which dost thou wish to hear, O faithful (hearer), this Apostle who knew the secrets of God the Word, or the mad Nestorius and his wicked followers who say that another man, distinct from the Word, bore and suffered everything for us?

We, on the contrary, believe in the Only Begotten God the Word, Who came down and was embodied of the Virgin in an ineffable manner, and remained, in His nature, God. We do not say, like the erring disciples of Eutyches, that He was embodied in the Virgin, but not of her; but we believe (that He was embodied) *in* her and *of* her, and not in any other way He might have pleased, as those liars claim. We say that He wished to become, and became (man) of the Virgin, who was of the seed of the house of David, as the Books teach, and as the teachers of truth have delivered unto us; not that a man, who was not, came into existence in the Virgin and adhered to God, as

---

(1) I St. John, I, 1-3.
(2) B omits all as far as « He Who was invisible ».
(3) B omits all as far as « He Who was silent ».

the impious Nestorius said, which man bore and suffered all the things of his nature in agreement with his own nature. Not so || does truth affirm, not so does faith declare. For he who counts 142
another man with God, introduces a quaternity in his doctrine and destroys the dogma of the Holy Trinity. With pagans is such a doctrine to be counted, for, like them, it errs inventing a new god, against that which is written, « There shall not be to thee a new god » (1). It adores a new god, a man born of a woman.

It is not a man, therefore, that was exalted, was honored, and became God; but it is God Who abased Himself, humbled Himself, emptied Himself, and became man; and because He is God by His nature, and did not become God, not being God (first), for the same reason, having become man, He did not change, but remained one God as He is, and He is counted, with the Father and with the Spirit, one Holy Trinity: « Go ye forth, teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost » (2). One Father, with Whom there is no other Father; one Son with Whom there is no other Son; one Holy Ghost with Whom there is no other Spirit. There is not (in each divine person) one with one, and another || with another, for each one of them is one: the Father 143
Who has no body; the Son Who was really embodied; and the Holy Ghost Who is adored with the Father and with the Son. This is the Holy and Adorable Trinity Which we confess; outside of It, we know no other, and anything which is named and called God outside of It, is to be anathematized.

I have written to you these things in haste, O holy servants of truth, not as teaching, but to show the conformity of my faith

(1) Deuteronomy, v, 7.
(2) St. Matthew, xxviii, 19.

with yours. I pray that in this (faith) I may depart from this life to its life, and that I may be offered in sacrifice for this truth which I confess. I exhort you also to be open defenders and preachers of the truth. Be not afraid of man; do not desist from fighting zealously for the truth, saying: « We are solicitous for the quiet of our ascetic life ». Ascetic life is beautiful (indeed), and the works of justice are worthy of praise. (But) these (works) are members whose head is truth, and if the head is cut off, the members perish.

Let no man say: « I keep my faith to myself »; for thou
144 dost not || preserve it in thyself, if, seeing it perish in others, thou remainest negligent. Where is the virgin who would insist on staying in her chamber, if she heard that her father's room is on fire? If she remains negligent, it will happen that the fire will become master of the room in which she dwells. Therefore, you also, without losing the purity of your monastic life, be defenders and open preachers of the truth; and pray also for me, I beseech you all at your feet, that I may be found worthy to suffer for my God as He suffered for me.

I heard that, after I had gone from you, they circulated (1) false reports about me, calling me a deceiver and corruptor. As to myself, I pray that such an error may remain with me to the end of my life. May God forgive them and grant them pardon; may He open to them the gate of repentance that they may know His truth.

(2) Anathema upon Nestorius and Eutyches, and their doctrines and their disciples; upon every one who agrees with them; upon every one who does not anathematize them with mouth and heart, and does not confess that Christ, God the Word, one of the Trinity, was crucified for us.

---

(1) B has « they wrote ».
(2) B and C omit all as far as « What you have heard ».

If any man love not Our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema [1].

|| The End [2]. 145

What you have heard by word (of mouth), I have sent to you in writing, and also to the holy friends whom I have not seen in the body, by Ephrem, the bearer of this letter to Mar Acacius, the priest, who, for a long time, after the example of his master, has waged a war of this kind. Therefore, have courage, for this is the time of the harvest, in which we will reap the new fruits of the works of justice, in the field of the zeal for the faith of Christ God, Who is over all; to Whom be glory for ever. Amen.

B.

|| The Letter of St. Mār Aksenāyā to the pure Monks of Bēth-Gaugal. 146

Christ has, in these days, manifested the light of Redemption to the faithful people. Behold, joyful news and good tidings are proclaimed to-day in the midst of the churches, because error has been deserted by all its votaries, and truth has been exalted by all its heralds. This news, which is full of joy, together with the reports and tidings of life, I too wish to confirm and make known to Your Holinesses through this humble letter of mine. Though of little worth in itself, the joyful news it contains will render it dear in your eyes. Owing to my ignorance, I cannot speak anything worthy to be uttered in your assemblies; therefore, I shall lean my discourse

(1) I Corinthians, xvi, 22.
(2) Thus far Ms. A. What follows is found only in B and C.

upon other helps, that it may find outside of itself the dignity which it has not by nature. For when an humble man speaks before princes, their great kindness will manifest itself in his regard.

Well you, Fathers, you are princes, and this title you have earned it justly by your works; for, where are not your labors
147 spoken of? Where has not || the fame of your holy monastery spread? Who has not admired, who has not wondered at the cruel persecutions (which) you (have suffered)? The (very) mention of your rule causes the lax to fear, for the weak are wont to be afraid when they hear of your courageous works. But as these tremble at the mention of your fervor, so also the strong take heart, and try to imitate the zeal (which you display in) your works. Your conduct is to the indifferent what salt is to food, a condiment. And as light dispels darkness, so also the fame of your fervor drives away all weakness. It is not vain glory which upholds your labors, but the love of God; and therefore you do not practise virtue in appearance, but in the truth of a pure understanding. It is not indeed only the figure of justice which you have put on, but the truth of justice is fixed in your thoughts. To-day, you form an illustrious remnant among all the disciples, and you have preserved, so to speak, your rule of life without change; for laxity, which in every way has injured many, has not inserted its teeth into the sound body of your works; and dejection of mind, which is wont to spoil the labor of others, has not prevailed against your treasures. Neither the fear of men nor the flattery of the great has ruled over you. You have not bartered the truth for earthly presents, and you have not ceased
148 || from your zeal for the faith for the sake of temporal gifts, and your monastery is not addicted to begging like those which subsist in that way. You have not sold Christ for sheaves of barley and loaves of bread like those who sell Him for such prices.

It is written that Judas sold Him for thirty (pieces) of silver; but those disciples in name (only) sell Him every day

for things more contemptible and abominable than that. Those who act thus serve their belly and not God; in them is fulfilled that which was written by Paul [1], « Their god is their belly, and their glory their shame ». And again he says, « Their mind is wholly upon the earth »; because they were born for the earth and not for heaven, their eyes are fixed altogether on the things of the earth.

Now the disciple who knows Christ and delights in Him cannot fail to experience sorrow when he hears a blasphemy against Him. For as our body naturally suffers when a wound is inflicted upon it by iron, or a stone, or anything else, so also does the soul of the true disciple suffer when witnessing a blow and an insult against Christ. Is there a greater insult
|| than that which the new Jews [2] of our day utter, blaspheming 149
Christ face to face, subtracting from the honor (due to) Him, reviling His glory, and saying to Him, « Thou art a man, and Thou makest Thyself God? » [3]. They try to show that His glory is not His own; that He received everything from the favor of another; that He is not God by His own nature, but was made God recently. For these devils (the heretics), without being ashamed, speak of Christ as one speaks of idols, because they are idols who are turned into gods when they are not such. It is not so, however, with Christ, O godless man, but by nature He is God. If then He became what He was not, as it is written of Him, it is not that from man He became God, but from God He became man and remained as He is, God.

A body did not take Him, but He took (a body). For He did not receive any glory from the body that He took, but by His embodiment He gave glory to our miserable nature. He did not come to a creature to be made God, but to be known

(1) PHILIPPIANS, III, 19.
(2) The Nestorians and the adherents of the Council of Chalcedon were called « Jews » by the Monophysites.
(3) St. JOHN, x, 33.

as God. His appearance amongst us was not from nothing into
something, but it shows truly that He is something which does
not change. For He was born of the Virgin corporally, and not
in so far as He is God. But because He became man of the
Virgin, in this He had a beginning; for in so far as He is,
150 not even from the Father has He a beginning. Because He
became man, we are not ashamed to say that He had a begin-
ning from the Virgin; for He Who, as God, is without beginning,
became, as man, subject to a beginning; and He Who, as God,
is spiritual, infinite, and with the Father, became, as man, a
body, and finitein the Virgin. He Who, as God, designs, fashions,
shapes, joins, and creates the fetus in the womb, the Same, as
man, was formed and shaped, and became a child in person. He
Who, as God, nourishes every thing, waters it, and gives it the
increase, Who supports, holds, and preserves all things, the
Same, as man, was carried and grew, was held in arms, sucked
milk, and received increase in His person. He Who as God
experiences neither hunger. nor fatigue, nor sleep, nor ignorance, the
Same as man was hungry and thirsty, ate and drank, was sleepy
and slept, and asked questions to learn. He Who, as God, is
above suffering and insult, Whose nature is not subject to death,
the Same, as man, suffered, was insulted, slapped in the face,
scourged, and really tried by death; and He Who is always
one without change because He is God, rose from the grave on
the third day because He became man. When He lay and re-
clined dead in Scheol, He was preparing the resurrection for all,
151 was ruling the hosts of heaven and all creatures by His nod,
creating bodies and putting the limbs together and breathing in
the souls, and governing the worlds and all creatures, as God Who
is everywhere.

It is a mystery we propound here, and we are not writing about things mine or thine. For Christ is believed to be God and man, not in the sense that we believe that He Who took a body is one, and the body that He took, another,

but in order to signify by the word « God » that He was begotten by the Father, and by the word « man » that He was embodied of the Virgin. For we do not despise His humanity, and we do not deny His divinity, and we do not divide Him into two. Who is one even after He was embodied. For upon the throne, He is God and near God, and in the womb, man and with men. In the Father He is living like the Father, Son and Substance; with the dead, He was dead like them and man like them. The Spiritual One did not die in so far as He is Spiritual, and God did not suffer in so far as He is God. He has no beginning, to the extent that He is without a beginning in His generation from the Father (?). He suffered, therefore, because He took a body, and He died because He became a brother of mortals. He had a beginning in the womb, because He was born like ourselves. We confess without blushing that God became man, that the Impassible One became subject to suffering, and the Living One tasted death. The Living One then
tasted death in order || to vivify (our) mortal nature. God became 152
man, that men might become the sons of God. For I do not deny that He vivified me, and I do not attribute to another the redemption which He wrought for me. If the death and the suffering were of another, the redemption and life which were merited for me would be of man, not of God. It is not another, therefore, who vivified me by one who died, but the very One Who died, vivified me by His own death. And if it is written « God was reconciled by Christ with the world » (1), it is not that God the Word (was reconciled) by a man, as the wicked (heretics) interpret, but that God the Father (was reconciled) by His Beloved Son, as this Apostle again said, « God was reconciled with us by the death of His Son » (2). He also said: « He (God) did not spare His

(1) 2 Corinthians, v, 19.
(2) Romans, v, 10.

Son, but delivered Him up for us all » [1]. Therefore, he who does not confess that God died, does not believe that the Son of God died, but opposes the teaching of Paul. For, when the Holy Books say that the Son, or Christ, or the Only Begotten died, it means that God died; and the words, « In the beginning was the Word » [2], are known to refer to the Son of God, for the Son is not different from the Word.

Of this very Son the Apostle said, « God was reconciled by His death ». Therefore he who is scandalized ad the mention of death, does not believe that the Son of God is God.

He who distinguishes Christ into two, does not worship the Trinity.

153 || He who says that Christ is a man, is a partner of the heathens and the Jews.

He who attributes glory to the one and humiliation to another, openly confesses two sons and makes void the redemption which came to our nature.

He who says that the person of a man who was not God was made God, sets up an idol, forms an image, and makes a new god.

He who does not confess that God emptied Himself, and took the likeness of a servant, as Paul teaches [3], does not know that Christ is the equal of God [4].

He who does not believe that the Only Son of God was given for the redemption of the world in the love of the Father, does not understand the love of God for the world.

He who does not hold for certain that He Who was crucified was one of the Trinity, has not received the freedom and joy of baptism, and has not as yet been redeemed from the sentence of death and from the original curse.

---

(1) Romans, VIII, 32.
(2) St. John, I, 1.
(3) Philippians, II, 7.
(4) Philippians, II, 6.

Whosoever is ashamed to declare that Christ is God, him shall Christ put also to shame before God and before His holy angels.

The disciple who does not confess that the Impassible One suffered, and the Immortal One died for us, is a heathen, not a disciple.

He who does not confess that Jesus is Lord from eternity, has not the odor of Christ.

|| He who says that Jesus was made Lord and Christ by ano- 154
ther, as if He was not so (by nature), but became so recently, brings God into contempt.

He who attributes number (1) to the one Christ, and counts in Him two persons or distinguishes two sons, such a one is not a member of Christ, and has not been numbered among the host of the chosen ones of God.

He who does not confess that He, Whom John called « the Word », is the very Same of Whom Matthew wrote, « Son of David and Son of Abraham » (2), such a one has not been written in (the book) of the adoption of the Heavenly Father.

He who says that He of Whom it is written, « He was in the beginning, and He was with God, and He was God » (3), is not the Power of the Most High, (the Power of Whom) the Angel said to the Virgin, « Thou shalt conceive in the womb, and shalt bring forth a son; and thou shalt call His name Jesus » (4), such a one is anathematized by the word of Jesus.

He who says that John wrote of one, and Matthew, Mark, and Luke, of another, such a one is a stranger to the Gospel of the Apostles and to the preaching of the Prophets.

He who says that the name of Christ signifies two natures distinct and separate the one from the other, and not one nature

---

(1) *i. e.* two persons or two natures.
(2) St. Matthew, i, 1.
(3) St. John, i, 1.
(4) St. Luke, i, 35, 31.

(k^{e}yānā), and one prosopon (parṣopā), and one person (q^{e}nomā), who was embodied and became man of the Virgin, such a one denies the faith and is worse than those who do not believe.

He who says that there are in Christ one and another, God Creator and a man created as one of us, and does not confess
155 || that the Same One is the likeness of God as Creator, and the likeness of a servant as being in the body, such a one is as yet a servant of sin, and has not received the freedom of Christ.

He who says that, in the one person of Christ, there are the Giver and the Receiver, one giving mercy and the other receiving mercy, and does not confess that He is altogether the Giver and the Distributor of good things to others, is filled with the malice of the devil.

He who says that the half of Christ is the Redeemer, and the other half is redeemed, and does not confess that He is wholly Redeemer, on account of which He was called Jesus, which is interpreted Saviour (1), this one is cut off from the redemption which Christ wrought by His Cross.

He who does not confess that He, Who is perfect God and the consubstantial Son of the Father, is also perfect man from the human nature, shall not be counted among men (for whom He became man).

He who imagines that there was only a mere adhesion (of a body) to the person of Christ, and not a real embodiment in the acknowledgment of one person, such a one has no relationship with Christ.

He who says that the infinite God dwelt in a finite man as He dwelt in the Prophets and in the just, and does not confess that He Who, as God, is infinite, is the Same Who became finite by becoming man, (such a one) has not as yet passed from a corrupt error into the fold of the knowledge of Christ.

---

(1) St. Matthew, i, 21.

He who does not confess that the Athlete, who fought for our nature || in the desert against the Adversary, is the natural 156
Son of the Father Who, in so far as He became man, waged war against the Adversary, but thinks that God raised up another Athlete from our nature to triumph for Himself and for us, such a one is a stranger to the victory of Christ.

He who says that Christ was justified by His works, and became the equal of the Most High by the practice of His virtues, and that He is not exalted and is not God by His nature, such a one is without any virtue and is filled with the malice of the devil.

He who says that He Who raised the dead is one, and He Who was tried by death, another, the death of such (a man) has not yet ceased.

He who does not believe that He Who, as man, was apprehended by the Jews and led to the death of the Cross, is the Same Who, as God, in the power of His divinity caused creatures to tremble, shall experience the wandering of Cain all the days of his life.

He who says that He Who cast out Legion (1) from the man (in the Gospel) is one, and He Who was comforted by the Angel at the time of His passion (2), another, in such a one dwells Legion whom Jesus drove out.

He who does not confess that glory and humiliation are of one Son, Who is one person and one nature who was embodied, such a one is an embodied devil.

He who says that there are this and that (person or nature) in the one Christ, has not as yet put off the « old man ».

He who does not confess that He Who said, « My Father worketh until now, and || I work » (3), is the Same of Whom Peter 157

(1) Cf. St. Luke, viii, 30, and St. Mark, v, 9.
(2) St. Luke, xxii, 43.
(3) St. John, v, 17.

wrote, « He hath been exalted by the right hand of God and hath received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost » (1), in such a one the evil spirit dwells.

He who says that the body of our Lord came down from heaven, has not been redeemed with the sons of men.

He who says that the aspect of Christ was a false appearance, and not a real embodiment from the nature of the Virgin, is a disciple of Mani and Marcion.

He who says that God refused to take a body of our nature as being defiled, and confesses that a body was formed for Him from another place, shall be cut off from the life which the corporeity of God has prepared for us.

He who does not confess that the Word became the seed of David and Abraham in the flesh, and took a body really and without change from the Virgin who brought Him forth, has not as yet changed from the old error.

He who does not anathematize Nestorius with his whole soul and Eutyches with his whole mind, and their abominable doctrines which are dangerous to men, is anathematized in his soul and in his body.

Against all these doctrines, therefore, we have stood and still stand with our whole soul, that the true faith, which was delivered by Christ to His Church, may remain without change. We wage this war with gallant courage, and in the struggle which is for Christ, we stand unmoved by the gifts and honors
158 of the wicked. || Nor do we fear their threats, for Our Justifier is near; and in Him we have placed our confidence, for we have been believing for a long time that He will do what He has promised. And although many without the faith would take away our hope, in His true hope we are strengthened all the more. As in the war waged against Christ, we have arisen and have desired your own cooperation, we have written to you that you

(1) Acts, II, 33.

may be persuaded that we do not wish to triumph without you. You have done well to join in my conflict on behalf of truth, because we are in the truth and the (dogma of the) Trinity is held in the same sense by you and by us. You have agreed in your letters, and, by the signing of your names, you have confirmed, not anything new, but the very truth which you possess ([1]). For it is fitting that what we hold in the mind and confess with the tongue, we should also commit to writing, without fear and without trembling. For you are with God, and also with my humble person, and with all the cenobites of Syria, your brethren. Moreover, the faithful and just Emperor Zeno ([2]) and the archbishop ([3]) of the capital return you thanks for the anaphoras ([4]) which you have sent. And the same Christ-loving (Emperor) has openly declared that he gained the victory over his enemies ([5]) with (the help of) your prayers, and he is ready to give us ample reward || for the work which we have under- 159
taken for the peace of the churches, and to drive away from them the enemies of the Cross. May those who were accusing us be put to shame and confusion, even with the heretics, — those liars! They are abhorrent to us even more than the heretics, those men who, corrupted by their passions, have become workmen in the building of the devil, and are considered disciples on account of their garb (only).

Where are, O false disciple, (the words), « I am under obligation to fight for the truth until death » ? Where is the promise of thy profession? Where are the vows thou madest to God?

([1]) It is probable that Philoxenus refers here to the Henoticon of Zeno, which was promulgated in 482. Cf. *B. O.*, II, p. 36.

([2]) Zeno (474-491).

([3]) Acacius, archbishop of Constantinople, (471-489).

([4]) ܐܢܥ̈ܣ. The meaning of this word here seems uncertain, Cf. Payne-Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, sub voce, p. 274. Assemani (*B. O.*, II, 37) translates it by « Oblationes ». It may have been an address or letter sent by the Monks of Bēth-Gaugal to Zeno to congratulate him over his victory.

([5]) Basiliscus, Leontius, Illus.

Thou hast destroyed the seal and hast profaned the sign put upon
thee. Hearest thou not Christ saying: « Whosoever shall confess
Me, I will also confess him, and whosoever shall deny Me, I
will also deny him » (1); and again, « Whosoever shall seek to
save his life, shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life,
shall preserve it » (2); and this again, « Whosoever wisheth to
be My disciple, let him renounce himself, take up his cross, and
follow Me » (3); and Paul who says, « Confess with thy mouth
Our Lord Jesus Christ and believe with thy heart? » (4) Remember
also, besides these holy words, the teaching of the Prophets, and
the preaching of the Apostles, and the zeal of all the Doctors
on behalf of the true faith, and, what is more glorious and a
160 much greater wonder than all this, the Cross || and the humi-
liation of the Living God Who, for the establishing of faith and
the redemption of men, bore and suffered all the things that had
been written of Him. And all the heralds of the word of God,
if thou noticest well, were always persecuted because they fol-
lowed in the same way as their Lord.

Was there ever a teacher of divine science who did not seal his faith in the midst of afflictions, persecutions, contempt, insults, calumnies, injustices, cruel sufferings and bitter torments, and who did not by his patience put to shame those who persecuted him? But I, who announce the truth in the midst of sufferings like these, testify that the truth is with this man. Knowest thou not these things, O disciple in name (only)? If not, thou shouldst know them, and shouldst not find fault with those who fight for God against godless doctrines. Come to the help of the Lord, although He has no need of thee, and do not stay the hand of the others who give their lives in fighting for

---

(1) St. Matthew, x, 32-33.
(2) St. Luke, xvii, 33.
(3) St. Mark, viii, 34.
(4) Romans, x, 9.

the Lord. Hear the sentence pronounced by God against him who causes his brother to stumble, and tremble. I contend for thy inheritance [1], and thou contendest with me. I pronounce judgment against thy enemy for thy possessions which have been dilapidated, and thou becomest an adversary to me. I fight for the common faith, and thou settest thyself against me with the heretics. I toil and work || day and night that the truth which 161
was delivered to the Church may not be changed, and I direct the weapons of argument against those who deny the Cross, and thou upbraidest me (saying), « Hold thy tongue, let them do what they wish ». They want me to be silent lest I should expose their doctrines, and thou, with them, wantest me to remain silent. I hasten to root out division and to end the schism which they have caused in the faith, and thou declarest publicly that I am the cause of the division. They began a tumult, introduced a novelty [2], and disturbed the peace of all the churches, and thou considerest me as the author of the disturbance. I am zealous that the doctrine of the Trinity may remain as it is, without receiving any addition [3], without being increased by another (person), and thou accusest me falsely of preaching something new. Thou art looked upon as a disciple, but thou art an adversary. Thou puttest on the appearance of truth, but thou art entirely on the side of false men. Since thou lovest to be with them and blasphemest like them, thou wilt soon be put to shame like them.

Behold they are overthrown and they hide away, and they have no protector. The sword of justice is drawn against them and they cannot escape it. This I say to the disciples in name

---

(1) The inheritance of faith.

(2) Probably the definition of the Council of Chalcedon regarding the two natures in Christ.

(3) Because the Nestorians admitted two persons in Christ, Philoxenus accused them of adding a fourth person to the Trinity. He made the same accusation against Catholics for admitting two natures in Christ after the union.

162 only, because, when they are confounded, the glory || of your fortitude will be all the more manifest.

All the holy (brethren) who are here salute you. I also adjure you before God, the Lord of all, to remember me in (your) prayers at the time of your services, for I believe that by your prayers I have been preserved until now. Farewell in Our Lord Jesus Christ Who crowns your labors.

C.

163 || The letter of Mār Aksenāyā to Emperor Zeno on the embodiment and incarnation of God the Word.

O Christ-loving Zeno, Emperor, concerning the embodiment (methgaššemānūthā) and the humanifying (methbarnešānūthā) (1) of God the Word, Who is consubstantial with God the Father, and was begotten by Him before ages and worlds, Who is always God and near (2) God, Who is God the Word, because He was begotten by Him without passion (3) and with Him is not subject to time, we have learned, we believe, and we have received from tradition as follows: that He (God the Word) emptied Himself (4) and came into the womb of the Virgin, without leaving the Father, without separating Himself from Him with Whom, near Whom, and like unto Whom He always is. For we believe that, in so far as He is God, He is everywhere, that is, like the Father and like the Holy Ghost.

---

(1) As *Incarnation* does not render exactly the two Syriac words here, I have translated methgaššemānūthā by « embodiment », and methbarnešānūthā by « humanifying ». These seem to be the English equivalents.

(2) ܠܘܬ, apud.

(3) This word is taken here in its widest sense, as meaning a change or modification of any kind.

(4) Philippians, II, 7.

He wished to give life to men by His abasement, His embodiment, His passion, His death, and His resurrection. And He came to the Virgin without ceasing to be everywhere, and He was embodied in her and of her, and became man without change.
||For He did not bring to Himself a body from heaven as the 164
foolish Valentinus and Bardesanes assert; nor was His embodiment from nothing, because He did not wish to redeem a creature that did not exist, but He wished to renew that which, created by Him, had become old (¹).

We do not hold that (the Word) became man with a change in His nature, because God is not capable of change, change being a modification of things created; but, as He exists without having begun, so also He was not changed by becoming (man). For He became man by taking a body, and not by assuming a man whom He caused to adhere to His person; otherwise, we would be introducing an addition into the Trinity, and would be found to admit a son of grace, outside the Son of nature. Therefore, whilst adoring this God the Word, Who is the Only Begotten Son of the Father, I believe that He was really embodied, and was born of the Holy Virgin, for He, Whom she brought forth, has become (man) and has been embodied in her and of her. She did not bring Him forth spiritually, since (the Word) has His spiritual generation from the Father, and He did not become (man) as He was begotten by the Father, according to the order of the (divine) nature and of the essential generation. But the Virgin brought Him forth corporally in order that, through this corporal generation, we might be made worthy of the spiritual (generation). The Word, therefore, became something that He was not and remained something that we were
not (but became), that is, sons of God, yet || remaining what we 165
were by nature. For we became sons of God, although our nature

(¹) Cf. p. 97.

was not changed, and He became man by His mercy, although His essence was not changed.

I confess, therefore, one (only) person of the Word, and I believe that this same (person) is also man, that is, God Who became man; not that He dwelt in a man, not that He built to Himself a temple in which He dwelt. It is we who are His temples, and He dwells in us by His Spirit. He did not create a man in the Virgin before He dwelt in her, a man whom He afterwards assumed as another person; for, by His embodiment from the Virgin, He did not unite Himself to the person of a man, but to our nature. I do not acknowledge in the Virgin a man adhering to God, nor a person joined to another; but I see, with the eye of faith, a Spiritual Being, Who, without change, became corporal, and Mary brought forth, not a double (Son), as Nestorius said, but the Only-Begotten embodied, Who is not indeed half God and half man, but wholly God because He is from the Father, and wholly man because He became (man) of the Virgin.

I confess that there was a union of the natures, that is, (a union of) the divinity and the humanity, and I divide neither the natures nor the persons, nor the parts of this and that,
166 ||which have been united in an ineffable manner. I do not see two things where they became one, nor do I admit one where two are known to be. It is not true that a man was made, was considered independent (1), and then assumed by God; if we say this, we do not confess that corporeity belongs to God. If on the contrary we believe that the body belongs to Him, because He was made man, then corporeity is the property of the person of God, and not of another human person. For the body of each one of us does not belong to God, although we are the sons of the Father and the brothers of Christ; and likewise (the body)

(1) Sui juris, complete; literally « to his own count ».

of that man, whether you consider it from the point of view of the person, or of the nature only, cannot be regarded as belonging to God; therefore, it is not true that a body was created, was acknowledged as belonging to another (person), and was then taken by God and made His.

With John I cry out that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us (1), not by changing, God forbid! for « to change » is a modification, but « to become » belongs to the Economy (of the Word). For I learn from John and Paul that (the Word) has become; but that He was changed, none of those who saw and served the Word (ever) said. Besides, God the Word Himself teaches by His prophet, « I am the Lord, and I change not » (2). Where you would suppose that, by becoming embodied, He was changed, He testifies all the more to the truth of His own || immutability, and as if (already) embodied 167
from the Virgin, He cries out to those who think that perhaps He was changed by becoming (man), « I am the Lord, and I change not ». Of the one Son, therefore, are the two generations, the one from the Father and the other from the Virgin; of the one Son, and not of two natures, otherwise He would not be one. For if we admit (in Him) nature and nature, we must necessarily admit person and person, and consequently we must acknowledge two Sons and two Gods.

The person of the Son, therefore, became embodied by the will of the Father and of the Holy Ghost, and His embodiment does not exclude that He may be believed consubstantial with them, for He was begotten Son (by the Father) and He was born Son of (the Virgin). The Father had no corporal generation, because He is always Father; nor had the Holy Ghost, because He did not come from the Father as Son in order to become the Son of the Virgin. But that One was born,

(1) St. John, i, 14.
(2) Malachias, iii, 6.

Who was begotten. that is, the Son. And we believe that the Same is Son by two generations, and that He, to Whom belong the name and fact of Son from the Father, became truly the Son of the Virgin; for to Him indeed belong these two things « to become and to be born », and because He was Son,
168 He was born Son, that is, in becoming || man without changing. And since we hear from the Books that one person was embodied, that the same (person) was born, and is the Only Begotten of the Father and the Firstborn of the Virgin, we must believe that He is known (as such) even in all the humiliations and defects to which humanity is liable.

We confess, therefore, that the Virgin is *θεοτόκος* (yāldath 'alāhā), and we believe that the embodied Word, after being born of her corporally, was wrapped in swaddling clothes, sucked milk, received circumcision, was held on (His Mother's) knees, grew in stature and was subject to His parents, all this just as He was born. He did not need to be fed Who feeds (others), since He is known (to be) God, but He became subject to all this because He was made man, although perfect and complete in His nature and in His person. It is then only in so far as He became (man) that He grew. To Him belongs greatness by His nature; and humiliation, because He emptied Himself. The things of the Father are His, because He has the same essence; and ours are His, because He became like unto us. To Him honor, because He is the Lord of glory; to Him humiliation, because He revealed Himself in the flesh. His the fact that He was hungry, and His the fact that He multiplied bread. He was hungry, and (thereby) showed that He became like unto us; He fed the hungry, and (thereby) showed that the
169 power remains to Him. For His nature was not || changed when He became (man), nor was the strength of His power diminished.

He was baptized by John in the Jordan (1), and the Father

(1) St. Luke, III, 21-22.

testified that He is His Beloved Son. I recognize the Trinity in the Jordan: the Father Who speaks; the Son Who is baptized; and the Holy Ghost Who shows. The Son was baptized as man, and not in appearance, because the appearance of the dove belongs to the Holy Ghost, and the appearance of the humanity (1) belongs to the Father; but, with the Son, it is the reality of corporeity. The One Whom I have seen in baptism, I have acknowledged in the womb (of the Virgin), and the One Whom I have found in the womb, I contemplate stretched on the Cross. One of the Trinity was in the womb; one of the Trinity in baptism; one of the Trinity on the Cross.

We believe in one Son, in one Father, and in one Spirit. For there is no other Son than the one Who is adored in the Trinity, Who accomplished the Economy for us, and was crucified between thieves. For He, at Whose baptism the Father testified, « This is My Beloved Son » (2), is the Same Who cried out on the Cross, « Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit » (3). Since He calls God « His Father », it is certain that He is His Son. For He Who, as man, was stretched on the Cross, is the Same Who (at that very time) was ruling, as God, all creatures by His nod, because the source of His natural life was not broken by death. || For if we believe that, conceived as 170
man, He is God, we must necessarily admit that, enclosed as dead in Scheol, He is Life from Life, lest, because He became (man), His essence be considered as having changed, and lest we believe that by death the life of His nature was destroyed.

The Cross is the herald of the death and of the immortality of God; for, until then, we believed by hearing (4) that God

(1) The voice that was heard.
(2) St. Matthew, iii, 17.
(3) St. Luke, xxiii, 46.
(4) Ex auditu. Cf. Romans, x, 17.

is immortal; but, on the Cross, experience has shown (that) both (were true), for, whilst tasting death, He remained living. Death could not attack and destroy His life; but, by His death, the power of death was destroyed, so that this death (of the Son), after His becoming (man), is a miracle. For He Who suffered death for us was not mortal as one of us, otherwise the power of death over mortals would not have been destroyed. From all men we know that what is mortal shall die; but, that the Immortal be considered as having died corporally, was something new which took place once on the Cross.

Thus the immortality of God does not prevent us from believing in His death, nor does His death oblige us to deny His immortality. God was tried by death, and thereby He destroyed the power of death over all the children of men. As spirits
171 cannot die, He did not die spiritually; || besides, His nature is immortal. But, since the body is subject to the power of death, He was tried by death corporally. For there was not (in Christ) a body adhering to God, nor was there (in Him) a man as His temple, who was dissolved, and was raised up by the Word Who dwelt in him, as heretics imagine. But He Who was dissolved as man, the Same, as God, raised up (His own body). The Father also raised Him, according to the words of Paul, « God, His Father, Who hath raised Him from the dead » (1). The Holy Ghost also raised Him, for (Paul says again): « He (Christ) was known to be the Son of God by power, and by the Holy Ghost according to the resurrection from the dead » (2). He also raised Himself, as He said: « I have power over My soul to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again » (3). For the divinity did not leave the body (of Christ), when He cried out on

(1) Galatians, I, 1.
(2) Romans, I, 4,
(3) St. John, x, 18.

the Cross, « Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit » (1). And it is not a man that said to the Father, « My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me? » (2); but He called Him « His Father » because He is consubstantial with Him, and « His God », because He became man. For He Who was suspended on the Cross, by commending His Spirit into the hands of His Father, gave to the souls of men a relationship with the Father, and the Same, with His body, descended into Scheol, and prepare the resurrection of the bodies that were there.

We do not therefore subject the nature of the Word to passion; nor do we believe that a man distinct from Him died.
But we believe that He Who, as God, is above || death, expe- 172
rienced it as man. (We believe) that He is the Only Begotten Son, one of the Trinity, as is clear from His own words to His disciples: « Go ye forth, teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost » (3).

I was baptized, therefore, in the name of Him Who died, and I confess that He, in Whose name I was baptized, died for me, and I believe that I have put on in baptism Him in Whose name and in Whose death I was baptized, according to the words of Paul (4). For I have put on spiritually in the waters (of baptism) the Spiritual Being Who became corporal, and I confess that the Living One Who, experienced death in the flesh, is He Who raises (the dead) and gives life; thus not taking anything from the Trinity, as the foolish Sabellius and Photinus have thought (to do), nor dividing its persons, like Arius and Macedonius, nor adding another person to the Trinity, as Theodore and Nestorius have imagined, nor saying that one of its persons suffered a change, like Apollinaris and Eutyches.

---

(1) St. Luke, xxiii, 46.
(2) St. Mark, xv, 34.
(3) St. Matthew, xxviii, 19.
(4) Cf. Galatians, iii, 27.

Therefore, I say anathema to the impious Nestorius and to
his doctrine, which, in the one Christ, admits a distinction of
natures and of persons, attributing the miracles to God and the
173 sufferings to the man, denying openly the Economy || of the Word
Who was made man..

I also say anathema to Eutyches the heretic, and to his followers, because he denies that there was a real embodiment of God from the Virgin, and regards as hallucinations the mysteries of His corporeity.

In saying anathema to these doctrines, I agree with the Holy Books, and adhere to the tradition of the Fathers from whom I have received the true and apostolic faith, that faith by which I have been made worthy, with all the baptized, of life, of freedom, and of adoption.

I have written these few lines, O pious Emperor, and have sent them to Your Christianity, because you have ordered it, to confound the heretics who question my faith in Christ, and also to edify those who think as I do, and who, made bold by divine love, try to defend me.

PART THIRD

TEXT

A.[1]

ܐܓ[ܪܬܐ ܕܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ][2] ܕܐܬܬܒܥܬ
ܡܢܗ ܠܘܬ ܕܪ̈ܝܢܐ[3]

ܠܡܘܪ̈ܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܘܢܟ̈ܦܐ ܘܡܗܝ̈ܡܢܐ. ܗܕ̈ܝܪܐ Vat. Syr. 138 fol. 120 r.
ܫܠܝ̈ܚܐ ܒܟܗܢܘܬܐ ܕܪ̈ܝܢܗ[4] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܟܠ.
ܠܡ̈ܠܝܐ ܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ. ܩܒ̈ܠ ܬܘܕ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܟܘܢ

---

[1] The present text which is that of ms. 138 is called A. In the notes B = ms. 135 and C = ms. 136. When a variant reading extends to more than one word, its beginning has been marked with the sign *. [2] The words between brackets are no longer legible. There is space only for 2 or 3 words; the title as given by Assemani *Bibl. Apost. Vatic. Catal.* p. 104 ܬܘܒ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ ܕܡܠܟܗ ܕܡܕܢܚ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ has been taken probably from ms. 136 and is by no means original. [3] The title in B is: ܚܠܦ ܣܠܟܗ ܕܡܕܢܚܝܘܬܐ ܡܡܫܠܐ: ܡܡܫܚܢܝܢ ܠܡܣܒܪܐ ܕܒܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܐ ܕܒܚܝܡܣ. ܡܚܢܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܕܢ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ: ܕܟܠܗ ܕܗܝܢܐ: ܡܫܠܡ ܚܪܝܐ ܕܡܡܫܒܚܢܘܬܐ. The title in C is: ܬܘܒ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ ܕܡܠܟܗ ܕܡܕܢܚ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ. [4] B ܗܢܐ .ܕܪ̈ܥܝܐ.

ܕܥܒܕܘ ܡܩܠܣܝܢ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܒܬܘܫܒܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ. ܒܠܒܘܢ [1]
ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܣܝܡܬ ܒܦܓܪ ܘܒܪܘܚ. ܕܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܘܡܕܝܢ̈ܬܐ [2] ܀ ܫܦܝܪ
ܘܦܐܝܐ ܠܗ ܠܥܙܪܐ ܕܟܠܝܐ ܢܬܡܠܠ. ܡܛܠ ܕܕܡܘܬܐ
ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܥܡܠ ܥܙܪܐ ܒܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܕܡܬܓܠܝܢܘܬܗ ܕܒܠ
ܒܠ. ܕܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܗܘܐ ܟܕܘ ܕܒܠ ܒܠ ܢܕܝܕ
ܗܕܢܐ ܐܦ ܥܙܪܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܘܐ ܐܬܟܠ ܒܟܠܡܐ ܕܠܒܠ
ܢܗܪ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܝܪ ܗܘ ܥܙܪܐ [3] ܗܿܘ ܕܫܡܗ ܠܥܙܪܐ.
ܕܩܕܡ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܫܡܥܬܐ ܐܘܡܪܘܗ، ܐܝܬܘܢ
ܒܗܝܢܐ.[4] ܘܩܕܡ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܫܗܘܢ ܫܡܗܝܢ ܐܝܬܘܢ ܐܒܪܘ
ܠܐ ܐܟܪܙܐ. ܘܟܕ ܡܠܟ ܕܠܘ ܒܠܫܢܗ ܒܦ̈ܬܠܐ ܥܣܩܘܬܐ
ܠܫܡܥܐ ܢܒܝ̈ܘܗܝ، ܠܥܙܪܐ. ܐܠܐ ܐܦ ܩܕܡ ܒܟܬ̈ܒܐ
ܢܛܠܝܘܗܝ. ܒܬܘܟܠܢܐ ܕܡܬܬܟܠ ܒܡ ܡܘܬܐ. ܐܡܪ̈ ܠܝ
ܕܠܐ ܬܬܕܚܠܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܩܛܠܝܢ ܦܓܪܐ. ܢܦܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ
ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܠܡܩܛܠ. ܘܬܘܒ ܒܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܚܠܝܬܐ ܕܩܕܡ
ܕ̈ܘܪܫܐ ܡܠܝܢ[5] ܘܡܓܢܚ ܒܥܘ̈ܕܪܢܘܗܝ، ܕܢܛܠ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ
ܕܐܬܥܠܡ ܠܝ ܒܪ ܐܡܪܝ. ܕܟܠ ܕܢܘܕܐ ܒܝ ܩܕܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ: *ܐܦ
ܐܢܐ ܐܘܕܐ ܒܗ [6] ܩܕܡ ܐܒܝ ܕܒܫܡܝܐ ܘܩܕܡ ܡܠܐܟ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܘܡܢ ܕܢܟܦܘܪ ܒܝ.[7] ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܐܟܦܘܪ ܒܗ ܩܕܡ ܐܒܐ [8]

---

[1] C ܒܠܒܘܗܝ. [2] B and C add: ܘܗܕܐ ܒܝܕ ܠܝ ܫܘܐ ܐܢܐ ܒܡܙܪܘܢܝ ܐܒܘܢ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܠܟܘܬܗܘܢ. ܐܢܫܐ ܒܚܝܐ ܫܡܝܐ ܫܡܝܐ ܡܠܟ ܀ [3] B ܒܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܕܡܬܓܠܝܢܘܬܗ. [4] C ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ. [5] C ܡܠܟܝ. [6] B ܐܘܕܐ ܒܗ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ. [7] B adds: ܩܕܡ ܒܢܝܢܫܐ. [8] B ܐܒܝ ܕܒܫܡܝܐ.

ܘܥܒܕ ܡܠܟܘ̈ܬܐ. ܒܗܕܐ ܗܘܝܠ ܚܠܦ ܓܠܘܬܐ ܗܦܟ[1]
ܢܦܩ ܐܠܘܗܝ ܕܢܒܪܘܢܗ، ܠܢܘܪܐ[2] ܘܠܐ ܢܒܗܬ ܘܢܬܚܣܕ·
ܘܢܦܩ * ܟ̈ܪܦ ܣܘܦܠܝܐ.[3] ܘܢܬܦܪ ܠܟ̈ܝܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܬܚܬܘܗܝ
ܘܡܫܟܠܗ ܕܢܘܪܐ. ܐܝܟܐ ܚܢܪ ܕܠܚܫ̈ܢܐ *ܝܪܟܐ ܕܢܬܦܪ[4]
ܚܒܪܐ ܠܡܚܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܚܣܝܢ ܕܢܗܘܐ.[5] ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܘܪܚ
ܒܡܘܒܠ ܕܡܚܣܝܐ. ܘܢܦܩ ܠܦܬܓܡܐ ܫܠܝܛܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ.[6] ܠܐ || Fol. 120 v.
ܡܬܘܡ[7] ܡܚܣܝܢ ܡܕܡ ܦܣܩ ܠܫܐܦܐ ܕܪܘܓܙܗ. ܕܟܘܬܪ
ܒܟܬܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܣܦ.[8] ܡܛܠ[9] ܕܒܣܝܡ ܗܘ ܘܫܠܐ
ܢܘܪܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ. ܘܟܠ ܢܦܫܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܠܦܬܓܡܐ ܠܗ ܚܫܐܝܬ
ܡܠܗܘܢ ܠܗ ܕܬܟܒܫܘܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܓ̈ܠܝܢܐ ܬ̈ܠܡܐ
ܘܗܘ̈ܕܐ ܡܪ̈ܢܐ ܘܟܠ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܘܪܚ ܒܗܕܐ ܗܘܢܝܬܐ.[10]
ܒܪܚܡܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܒܬܪܗ. ܘܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܡܕܡ
ܕܢܦܩܘܢ ܚܐܦܐ ܕܚܘܒܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܒܬܪܗ. ܠܐ ܢܘܪܐ ܘܠܐ
ܫ̈ܘܬܐ. * ܠܐ ܡܦ̈ܩܐ[11] ܘܠܐ ܡܦ̈ܪܐ. ܠܐ ܡܦܩܬܐ ܕܡܢ
ܐܬܪܐ ܠܐܬܪܐ. ܠܐ ܫܒܘܩܐ ܐܠܝܨܐ ܕܒܒܝܬ[12] ܐܡ̈ܪܐ.
ܠܐ ܦܘܫܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܠܒ̈ܒܐ. ܠܐ ܚܒܘ̈ܫܐ ܘܦܠܛ̈ܘܪܐ.
ܠܐ ܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܐܢܫ̈ܐ. ܠܐ ܗܦܟ ܓ̈ܦܐ ܕܡܪ̈ܕܝܐ. ܠܐ
ܢܦܪܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܓܢܒܐ. ܠܐ ܘܢܘܣܬܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܟܠܡܐ.
ܠܐ ܡܪ̈ܕܐ[13] ܕܡܬܢܫ̈ܝܢܐ ܘܠܐ[14] ܡܬܢܫ̈ܝܢܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ

[1] B ܗܦܟ ܠܡ. [2] B C ܠܡܢܘܪܐ. [3] B ܚܠܩܐ ܕܡܩܕܡܝܢܐ.
[4] B ܢܦܪ, C ܝܪܟܐ ܕܢܦܪ. [5] B ܠܡܗܘܐ. [6] B ܕܢܘܪܗ. [7] B C ܡܬܘܡ.
[8] B C ܕܐܘܣܦ. [9] B ܡܛܠ. [10] B ܠܗܘܢܝܬܐ, C ܠܗܘܢܐ. [11] B ܡܦܩܐ ܘܠܐ.
[12] B ܕܒܝܬ; in C no longer legible. [13] B ܡܪܕܐ. [14] B ܘܠܐ.

ܕܠܟܠ ܐܘ ܕܠܬܚܬ. ܐܫܟܚ ܕܢܦܩ ܢܦܫܬܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܣܘܟܗ
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ. ܕܗܢܘܢ[1] ܕܠܦܘܡܗ، ܠܫܪܪܐ ܘܐܬܓܒܘ ܒܗ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܦ ܦܘܠܘܣ ܡܕܡܐ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܙܒܢܬܐ
ܣܠܩ. ܒܠܗܘܢ ܕܐܒܗܬܗ ܡܡܠܠ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܡܪ. ܕܡܦܩ
ܐܝܟ ܕܢܪ[2] ܕܠܐ ܡܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܫܐ. ܘܠܐ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ. ܘܠܐ
ܫܬܠܐ. ܘܠܐ ܪܘܡܐ ܘܠܐ ܒܘܡܡܐ. ܘܠܐ ܕܡܝܟ ܘܠܐ
ܕܒܬܪܗ̈ܝܢ. *ܡܚܝܢ ܦܓܪܝܢ[3] ܠܗ ܡܢ ܣܘܟܗ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ
ܐܠܗܐ. ܗܕܐ ܡܚܝܢܬܐ ܦܠܐ ܕܢܦܘܩ *ܡܕܡ ܐܦܩܗ،
ܘܐܡܫܝܚܬ ܚܝܘܪ[4] ܒܗ ܟܠ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܬܠܡܝܕܘܗܝ
ܕܫܪܪܐ.[5] ܘܡܢ ܕܫܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܢܬܦܣܐ. *ܒܫܪܪܐ ܓܒܪ
ܘܒܣܘܟܐ[6] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܫܠܝܬܐ ܠܢܬ.[7] ܘܐܢܫܐ ܕܕܚܠ ܠܐ
ܡܫܡܠ ܒܣܘܟܐ. ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ ܓܒܪ ܫܕܐ ܒܠܡܕܡ[8] ܕܠܐ
ܐܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ. ܐܢ ܕܫܠܝܬܐ ܘܐܢ ܕܓܠܝܬܐ. *ܐܢ
ܫܦܝܪܘܬܐ[9] ܘܐܢ ܡܫܡܫ ܒܟ̈ܐܦܐ. ܐܢ[10] ܙܒܢܬܐ
ܕܢܫܝܐ. ܘܐܢ ܒܒܬܐ ܕܫܘܠܛܢܐ. ܗܠܝܢ ܘܕܐܒܗܬܗܘܢ ܠܒܪ
ܡܢܗ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܫܕܝܢ. *ܘܐܝܟ ܕܗܘܝܢ[11] ܠܐ ܡܬܪܝܡܐ[12] ܕܢܗܘܘܢ
ܒܫܪܪܐ. ܘܐܦ[13] ܠܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܡܫܝܢ *ܠܗܘܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ[14]
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܒܫܪܪܐ ܘܢܐܚܕܘܢ[15] ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ. ܗܢܘܢ ܓܒܪ

---

[1] B ܗܢܘܢ. [2] B omits. [3] B ܦܓ̈ܪܝܢ ܡܚܡܚܝܢ. [4] B ܘܚܘܪ C ܡܢ ܐܦܩܗܘ ܘܚܘܪ. [5] B adds ܘܠܐ ܢܦܠ. [6] B ܣܘܟܠ ܚܢܢ. [7] B C add ܗܘ. [8] C ܟܘܠ ܡܕܡ. [9] B ܘܠܐ ܡܫܘܪܝܢܘܬܐ. [10] B ܘܠܐ. [11] B ܘܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܗܦܟܝܢ. [12] B C ܡܬܪܝܡ. [13] B C ܐܦ. [14] B ܠܗܦܟܝܢ ܡܫܡܫܝܢ. C ܠܗܘܝܢ ܡܫܡܫܝܢ. [15] B ܘܠܐ ܕܢܣܒܘܢ.

ܕܐܠܗܘܬܗܘܢ ܒܪܫܗܘܢ ܗܘ̣ܝ.[1] ܘܗܘ̣ܝ ܒܡܢܝܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܪܬܐ
* ܕܟܠ ܫܢܝ̈ܗܘܢ.[2] ܟܠ[3] ܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܫܟܚ ܢܣܒ̇ ܘܟܬܒ̇
ܠܬܡܢ ܡܬܟܢܫܝܢ ܘܗܘܝܢ *ܥܡ ܟܠ ܟܠ ܐܟܚܕܗ̇.[4]
ܕܡܫܒܒܢ̈ܐ ܕܟܗܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܢܦܩܘܢ. ܘܡܢ *ܫܬܝܫܘܢ
ܦܬܓܡܐ[5] ܠܐ ܢܬܟܠܘܢ. ܚܢܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܘ ܚܒܝ̈ܒܝ: ܐܬܠܒܫܘܗܝ،
ܕܐܟܘܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܐ. ܠܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ *ܕܢܗܘܐ ܥܡ ܫܪܪܐ. ܗܘ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܫܡܝܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܟܗܢܐ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܗܘܢ ܕܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ.[6]
ܘܗܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܢܩܝܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܢܗܪܢ ܘܡܩܕܫ ܘܡܕܟܝܢ
ܘܡܫܒܚܢ ܕܠܐ ܕܡܝܐ. ܘܦܘܩܕܐ ܕܫܡܝܢ ܪܘܚܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܟܠܠ
* ܕܩܠܐ ܕܐܘܕܝ[7] ܒܠܘܬܗ ܕܡܠܬܐ[8] ܕܟܠ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܡܟܠܠ[9]
ܡܕܢܐ[10] ܡܬܬܟܒ. ܢܗܝܪܘܬ ܢܦܫܗ ܕܡܠܬ، ܚܠܐ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܘܒܡܫܩܬܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܒܬ ܡܢ ܒܬܪܐ ܡܙܝܢܐ
ܘܡܠܦܢܐ[11] ܕܒܕܬܐ ܓܒܝ ܒܒܬܡܒܬ،[12] ܡܚܝܝܐ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܠܫܕܬܐ ܘܒܡܫܚܐ ܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܕܡܫܒܚ[13] ܠܗ. ܥܡ ܫܪܪܐ
ܘܡܟܠܠ ܫܪܪܐ. ܘܠܒܗܬܬܐ ܘܒܐܪܐ[14] ܕܡܠܟܐ. ܬܠܡܝܕܐ
ܕܡܫܒܚܐ.[15] ܦܘܠܘܣ ܕܡܫܝܚ ܘܡܟܠܠܐ ܦܪܩ ܠܗ. ܘܟܕ ܐܦ
ܠܫܪܪܐ *ܗܘ ܕܠܒܬ ܘܡܚܘܐ ܐܢܐ ܡܫܝܚ.[16] ܡܟܠܠ ܒܪܐ
ܕܠܫܪܪܐ ܠܒܢܝܘܬܐ ܦܪܩ ܠܗ ܗܘܢ ܕܐܦܝܣܢ. ܘܐܦ[17]

---

[1] B C omits, C adds: ܘܠܡܒܣܡܘܬܗܘܢ ܒܥܠܠܬܗܘܢ. [2] B ܠܫܢܝܗܘܢ (C ܟܠ inst. of ܕܟܠ). [3] C ܒܟܠ. [4] B ܟܠ ܥܡ ܟܠ ܐܟܚܕܗܘܢ. [5] B ܢܣܒܘܢ ܦܬܓܡܐ. [6] B ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܢܗ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ. [7] B ܕܢܘܕܐ. [8] B C ܕܡܠܠܝ. [9] C ܘܡܫܟܠܠ. [10] B ܐܡܝ. [11] B ܐܦ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ. [12] B ܒܟܠܡܕܡ. [13] B ܕܡܫܒܚܝܢ. [14] B ܘܒܥܘܬܪܐ. [15] C ܕܡܠܦܢܐ. [16] B ܡܫܝܚ. ܗܘ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܢ ܡܠܟܐ. [17] B C ܐܦ.

ܠܒ̈ܢܘܗܝ، ܕܠܗ¹ ܕܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܡܬܝܠܕܢܐ² ܡܫܬܡܥܝܢ. *ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ

Fol. 121 r. ܐܘ ܡܛܠ ܗܘ³ ܕܒܪܐ. ܐܠܐ || ܡܛܠ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ

ܟܠ. ܗܘ ܕܐܬܓܠܝ· ܠܒ̈ܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܪܐ ܘܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܘܚ̈ܝܐ.

ܗܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܝܬܗ، ܒܪܐ̱⁴· ܒܗ ܐܟܘܬܗ،

ܪܘܚܗ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܚܕܐ ܘܐܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܚܕܐ

ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܕܐ. ܘܚܝܠܐ ܚܕ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ⁵ ܘܦܝܫ ܟܠܗ.

ܕܠܝܬ ܒܗ ܦܠܓܐ ܘܦܘܠܓܐ. ܘܐܦܠܐ⁶ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܘܐܝܬܝܘܬܐ.

ܘܠܐ ܕܢܦܠܓ ܘܢܦܪܘܫ. ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܒܬܠܝܬܐ ܘܬܠܝܬܐ ܒܚܕ· ܚܝܠܐ

*ܡܢ ܡܬܘܡ⁷ ܘܡܬܩܪܒܐ *ܡܢ ܡܬܘܡ.⁷ ܚܕܐ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ

ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܒܟܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܘܗܝ. ܡܢ⁸ ܡܬܘܡ ܘܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܟܠ. ܚܕ ܕܝܢ

ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܘܗܝ ܕܗܕܐ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܡܬܒܪܢܫ⁹ ܕܬܘܕܝܬ̱.¹⁰

ܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܐ. ܘܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܢ ܢܘܗܪܐ. *ܘܚܝܐ ܡܢ ܚܝܐ.¹¹

ܘܠܐ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܚ. ܒܝܚܝܕܝܘܬܗ¹² ܕܐܝܬܘܬܐ¹³

ܗܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܢܚܬ. ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܢ

ܐܠܗܐ. ܒܪܐ ܕܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܢ¹⁴ ܐܒܐ ܕܚܝܠܐ. *ܡܫܝܚܗ ܕܐܒܐ

ܘܡܠܟܗ ܕܐܝܬܘܬܐ.¹⁵ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܟܠ.¹⁶ ܢܣܒܬ

ܘܒܬܘܠܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܕܐܬܩܕܫܬ ܡܢ ܪܘܚܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ¹⁷ ܐܝܟ.

ܘܒܪܢܫܐ ܡܢܗ¹ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܐܟܘܬܢ̱¹

---

¹ B omits. ² C ܘܡܬܝܠܕܢܐ. ³ B ܡܢ ܡܛܠ ܚܢܢ ܐܘ ܡܛܠ C ܕܦܘܪܩܢܢ ܐܘ ܡܛܠ ܗܘ. ⁴ B ܒܪܐ̱. ⁵ C ܡܢ ܡܬܘܡ. ⁶ B C ܐܦܠܐ. ⁷ B C ܡܬܘܡܐܝܬ. ⁸ B ܘܡܢ. ⁹ B ܘܡܬܒܪܢܫ, C ܡܬܒܪܢܫ. ¹⁰ B ܕܐܬܘܕܝܬ. ¹¹ B C ܘܚܝܐ ܡܢ ܚܝܐ. ¹² C ܒܝܚܝܕܝܐ. ¹³ B ܕܐܝܬܘܬܐ. ¹⁴ B C ܡܢ. ¹⁵ B ܕܐܝܬܝܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܫܝܚܗ, C ܕܐܝܬܝܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܡܫܝܚܗ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܠܟܗ. ¹⁶ C ܟܘܠ. ¹⁷ C ܕܩܕܝܫܬܐ.

ܗܦܟ ܡܢ ܣܓܝܐܘܬܐ. ܒܪ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܐܘ ܚܘܠܛܢܐ ܐܘ ܫܘܓܢܝܐ
ܒܝܢܝܗ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ[1] ܐܡܪ ܒܐܝܕܐ
ܕܢܒܝܐ. ܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܫܬܚܠܦܬ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܬܚܠܦ
ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܚܒܝܫ. ܐܦܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ. ܗܘܐ
ܓܝܪ *ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ[2] ܕܠܐ ܚܘܠܛܢܐ.[3] ܘܐܬܓܫܡ ܘܒܬܪ ܐܝܟ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܪܘܚܢܐ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܘܡܬܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ[4] ܐܣܝܪܐ
ܐܝܟ ܠܗ ܕܬܬܡܚܐ ܬܘܩܢ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܢܦܫ ܠܗ.
ܐܦܠܐ ܒܡܣܒܪܢܐ[5] ܟܠ ܕܡܪ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܚܕܢܝܐ ܐܠܐ
ܐܬܓܫܡ ܡܢ ܚܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܐܬܚܡܣ ܠܬܪܝܢ. ܘܗܘܐ ܟܝܢܐ
ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܘܠܐ[6] ܐܬܦܠܓ[7] ܡܘܡܬܗ. ܗܘܐ ܘܠܐ
ܐܫܬܚܠܦ. ܡܛܠ[8] ܕܐܦ ܒܗܘܝܗ ܐܝܬܘܬܗ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ
ܒܬܪܬ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܓܝܪ ܒܐܝܬܘܬܗ. ܗܟܢܐ[1] ܒܬܪ
ܐܦ ܒܗܘܝܗ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ. ܘܗܘܐ ܒܬܪܗ
ܚܠܛܐ ܓܠܝܐ. ܘܒܠܝܐ ܟܠܗ ܓܒܗ ܟܪܣܐ. ܘܐܠܗܐ
ܟܪܣܐ ܓܒܗ ܡܪܟܒܐ. ܘܪܘܚܐ ܦܓܪܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܚܐ
ܐܬܚܫ. ܘܠܐ ܡܬܓܙܪܢܐ ܐܬܓܙܪ. *ܘܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،[9] ܟܕ
ܚܝܢܗ ܕܐܒܐ. ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܗܘܝܗ. ܐܬܓܙܪ ܓܝܪ
ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܘܡܢ[10] ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ. ܠܐ ܡܢ
ܫܡܝܐ ܐܬܐ، ܠܗ ܦܓܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܒܪܕܝܨܢ. ܘܠܐ
ܒܡܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܓܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܦܢܛܣܝܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ، ܐܝܟ

[1] B omits. [2] B C ܒܪܢܫܐ. [3] B C ܡܚܘܠܛܐ. [4] C ܕܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ.
[5] B C ܒܐܣܝܪܐ. [6] C ܘܠܐ. [7] B ܐܬܦܠܓܘ. [8] C ܡܛܘܠ. [9] B ܐܝܬܝܗ ܗܘ.
[10] B ܐܦ ܡܢ.

ܠܦܪܘܩܗ[1] *ܕܝܠܕ ܘܡܬܩܢܘܡ܂[2] ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܐ ܗܟܠܐ܂ ܘܠܐ ܚܢܢ ܐܫܬܘܠܦ
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܥܒܕܝܢ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܐ ܐܪܝܘܣ ܘܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ܂[3] ܘܠܐ[4]
ܒܪܝ ܡܪܕܝܐ ܐܬܒܥܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܪܥ ܒܫܘܠܦܢܗ
ܐܦܘܠܝܢܪܝܣ܂[5] ܐܠܐ ܢܣܒ ܦܓܪܐ ܘܗܘܐ[6] ܡܢ
ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܡܫܠܡܢܐ܂ *ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ
ܡܫܠܡܢܐ܂ ܠܘ ܒܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܕ݁ ܠܘ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܐܬܓܫܡ
ܗܘ ܡܠܬܐ܂[7] ܐܠܐ ܒܥܒܪܐ ܒܗ ܘܡܢܗ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ܂
ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ܂
ܐܠܐ ܐܡܟܐ ܒܥܒܪܐ܂ ܡܛܠ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܢܗ ܒܪܢܫܐ܂
ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܒܐܣܝܪܐ ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܬܚܠܛ ܐܠܗܐ܂ ܠܘ ܓܝܪ
ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܬܚܠܛ ܕܢܚܘܪ ܒܗ ܐܠܗܐ܂ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܠܦ
*ܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܐ[8] ܘܬܠܡ̈ܝܕܘܗܝ܆ ܒܥܙ̈ܐ܂ ܐܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ
Fol. 121 v. ܕܡܬܚܡ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ܂ ܗܘ ܐܬܚܠܛ ܡܢ ‖ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ܂ ܗ̇ܘ
ܓܝܪ ܕܟܠ ܠܗ̇ ܐܠܗܐ̇ ܗ̣ܘ ܕ݁ ܗ̣ܘ ܢܦܩ ܡܢܗ̇ ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ܂
ܘܠܗ̇ ܕܡܩܒܠܬ ܪܘܚܢܐܝܬ܂ ܠܗ ܕ݁ ܠܗ ܝܠܕܬ ܦܓܪܢܐܝܬ܂
ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܠܕܬ ܠܗ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܒܡܘܠܕܗ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ܂ ܗ̣ܘ
ܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܒܡܘܠܕܗ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ܂ ܡܢ ܚܕܐ ܠܚܕ
ܡܢ ܚܕܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ[9] ܗܘܐ܂ *ܘܡܢ ܚܕܐ[10] ܠܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܕܐ

---

[1] B ܠܦܪ̈ܘܩܐ. [2] B C ܕܝܠܝܕ ܘܡܬܩܢܘܡ. [3] B ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ , C ܐܘܢܘܡܘܣ.
[4] C ܠܐ. [5] ܐܦܘܠܝܢܪܝܘܣ , C ܐܦܘܠܝܢܪܝܣ. [6] B ܒܗܘܐ , C omits.
[7] B ܠܘ ܕ݁ ܠܘ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܐܬܓܫܡ. ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܒܥܒܪܐ ܐܠܗܐ
ܡܫܠܡܢܐ. ܗܘ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ. [8] B ܢܣܛܘܪܝܣ. [9] C ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ. [10] C ܘܡܚܕܢܐ.

ܠܒܪܬܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܘܡܢ ܚܙܘܐ ܠܗܠ ܡܢ ܚܙܘܐ ܣܠܩܐ
ܐܦܩܗ:[1] ܘܐܚܙܝܗ[2] ܚܙܘܐ ܠܗܠ ܡܢ ܚܙܘܐ ܒܥܘܡܩܗ
ܐܬܪܘܢ. ܢܘܗܪ[3] ܡܢ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ
*ܘܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ[4] ܕܠܒܫ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ[5]. ܘܡܫܠܛܝܢ ܘܚܝܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܬܪ̈ܝܢ
ܠܗܘ ܚܕ ܡܫܝܚܗ[6] ܕܐܠܗܐ. *ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܢ[7] ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ. ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ[8] ܘܡܢ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ. ܘܦܪܫܝܢ[9] ܘܣܡܝܢ ܒܗ ܒܗܘ
ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܐܬܓܠܝ[10] ܡܟܣܝܬܐ ܠܚܕ ܘܪ̈ܡܙܬܐ ܠܫܪܝܐ.[11]
ܘܫܒ̈ܠܐ[12] ܠܚܕ ܘܡܫܒܠܢܘܬܐ[13] ܠܐܣܝܪܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܓܙܪ
ܐܡܪܝܢ ܢܒ̈ܝܐ. ܕܚܕ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܘܚܕ
ܢܦܩ ܗܘܐ[14] ܘܐܚܪܝܢ[15] ܠܐ ܢܦܩ[16] ܗܘܐ. ܘܚܕ ܐܬܓܙܪ
ܘܐܚܪܝܢ[15] ܠܐ. ܘܚܕ ܪܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܚܪܝܢ ܠܐ. ܘܚܕ[17]
*ܐܟܠ ܗܘܐ ܘܚܕ ܠܐ. ܘܚܕ ܨܗܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܚܕ ܠܐ.[14]
ܘܚܕ ܕܡܟ ܗܘܐ ܘܚܕ[18] ܠܐ. *ܘܚܕ ܟܦܢ ܗܘܐ ܘܚܕ
ܠܐ.[14] ܘܚܕ ܕܚܠ ܗܘܐ ܘܚܕ ܠܐ. ܘܚܕ[19] ܫܢܐ ܗܘܐ
ܘܚܕ ܠܐ. ܘܚܕ ܕܡܝܐܬ[20] ܗܘܐ ܘܚܕ ܠܐ. ܘܠܐܚܪܢܐ
ܘܠܐܚܪܢܐ[21] ܡܫܠܛܝܢ ܐܦ̈ܩܝܐ. ܗܠܝܢ ܟ̈ܠܗܘܢ[14] ܡ̈ܠܐ
ܕܐܡ̈ܝܪܢ *ܥܠ ܡܫܝܚܐ.[22] ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܢܬܝܠܕ ܒܬܪ̈ܝܢ
ܘܐܚܪܢܐ[23] ܒܓܠܝܘܬܐ. ܘܚܕ ܢܚܫ *ܒܒܪ̈ܝܐ ܘܚܕ

---

[1] B ܢܒܥ. [2] B ܘܡܢ which is preferable. [3] C ܘܢܘܗܪܐ. [4] B ܘܒܪܢܫܐ.
[5] B ܡܢܝܢ. [6] B ܡܫܝܚܐ. [7] B ܘܡܢ. [8] C ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. [9] B ܘܡܦܪܫܝܢ.
[10] B ܕܐܬܓܠܝ. [11] B C ܠܐܣܝܪܐ. [12] B ܘܫܒܠܐ. [13] C ܘܡܫܒܠܢܘܬܐ. [14] B omits.
[15] B C ܘܐܚܪܢܐ. [16] B ܢܒܥ. [17] B omits, C ܚܕ. [18] B ܘܐܚܪܝܢ. [19] B ܚܕ.
[20] B C ܡܝܬ. [21] C ܘܐܚܪܢܐ. [22] B ܒܡܫܝܚܐ. [23] B ܘܚܕ.

ܒܥܠܡܐ.[1] ܘܚܕ ܢܣܒܬ ܒܡܘܬܢܐ ܘܐܣܝܪܐ[2] ܒܪܒܘܬܐ.[3]
ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܝܬ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܘ ܦܓܪܐ *ܠܒܪ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܐ[4] ܡܬܐܡܪ ܡܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܐܡܟܢܐ ܕܠܘ ܡܛܠ
ܕܐܬܬܠܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ;[5] ܐܘ ܦܓܪܐ[6] *ܡܘܡܟܐ ܢܫܐ ܠܒܪ
ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ[4] ܡܬܐܡܪ ܡܘܠܕܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܦܓܪܐ
ܐܬܬܠܕ· ܐܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܦܓܪܐ. *ܘܡܛܪ ܒܟܝܢܗ
ܐܠܗܐ.[4] ܘܠܘ ܦܓܪܐ ܐܬܚܠܦ ܐܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܪ
ܐܢܫܐ. *ܘܒܡܘܬܗ ܚܝܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܐܘܒܕ[4] · ܘܠܘ ܐܢܫܐ
ܒܪ ܢܫܐ[7] ܐܬܬܠܕ· ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܬܓܫܡ ܐܬܬܠܕ·
ܠܐ ܒܡܘܠܕܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܒܝܠܕܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ. ܚܕ ܗܘ
ܕܐܬܬܠܕ· ܘܚܕ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܓܠܝ.[8] ܘܐܡܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܠܘ ܐܢܫܐ. ܒܐܢܫܐ ܐܘ ܢܫܐ[9] ܒܪ ܢܫܐ[9] ܐܬܬܠܕ:
ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܫܝܚ[10] ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ
ܫܘܚܠܦܐ. ܘܗܘܝܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ *ܒܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܘܒܐܢܫܘܬܗ ܚܕ[10] ·
ܡܫܝܚܐ[11] ܐܦ ܒܝܠܕܐ ܚܕ ܬܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܠܘ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ.
ܕܐܠܗܐ[12] ܗܟܝܠ ܐܬܬܠܕ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܒܪܬܗ
ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܘܐܠܗܐ[13] ܐܬܓܠܝ ܫܠܗ ܟܠ ܡܚܙܪ ܙܪ̈ܘܗܝ
ܕܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܡܙ̈ܝܢܐ. ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܪܐ ܗܘ. ܘܒܪܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ.

---

[1] B ܒܡܘܬܢܐ ܘܚܣ ܚܢܦܐ (C ܘܐܣܝܪܐ inst. of ܘܚܣ). [2] B ܘܚܣ. [3] B ܒܪܘܒܬܐ. [4] B C omit. [5] C ܐܢܫ ܒܪ. [6] I would suggest ܦܓܪܐ ܕܡܘܡܟܐ. [7] B C ܐܢܫܐ. [8] C ܕܐܬܓܠܒ (sic). [9] B C ܐܢܫܐ. [10] B omits. [11] B ܘܡܫܝܚܐ. [12] B C ܐܠܗܐ. [13] ܘܕܐܠܗܐ?

ܘܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܘ. ܘܡܠܬܐ ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܘ. ܐܢ [1]
ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܬܪ ܕܐܬܓܠܝ. ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܓܠܝ. ܡܫܝܚܐ
ܡܝܬ. ܗܘܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܦ ܗܢ. ܠܘ *ܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܘ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܝܬ
ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܝܬ.[2] ܘܠܘ ܚܪܢܐ[3] ܗܘ ܝܚܝܕܝܐ
ܕܐܬܡܣܪ. ܚܠܦ[4] ܦܘܪܩܢܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ. ܘܚܪܢܐ[5] ܡܠܬܐ
ܕܠܐ ܐܬܡܣܪ. ܘܠܘ[6] ܚܪܢܐ[7] ܗܘ ܒܪܐ[8] ܕܚܫ ܘܡܝܬ
ܘܚܪܢܐ[5] ܕܗܘ، ܕܠܐ ܚܫܐ. ܒܬܪ ܕܗܘܒܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ
ܠܥܠܡܐ.. ܕܠܒܪܗ ܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܝܗܒ ܚܠܦܘܗܝ. *ܘܗܢܐ
ܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܕܐܬܡܣܪ[9] ܠܡܘܬܐ ܚܠܦ ܦܘܪܩܢܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ.
*ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪܢ[10] ܚܠܦܘܗܝ، ‖ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܒܣܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܝܟܢ Fol. 122 r.
ܒܢ. ܐܡܪ ܬܘܒ ܦܘܠܘܣ ܕܐܬܪܥܝܢ ܥܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܡܘܬܗ
ܕܒܪܗ. ܘܬܘܒ ܐܡܪ. ܕܐܢ ܥܠ ܒܪܗ ܠܐ ܚܣ. ܐܠܐ ܚܠܦ
ܟܠܢ[11] ܐܫܠܡܗ. ܘܗܢܐ ܒܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܥܝܢ ܥܡ ܒܡܘܬܗ
ܘܐܫܠܡܗ ܠܡܘܬܐ ܚܠܦܝܢ. ܠܘ ܚܪܢܐ[3] ܗܘ. ܐܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ[12]
ܒܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ[13] ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ. ܐܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ
ܗܟܝܠ ܐܢ ܒܪܐ ܘܐܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܘܐܢ ܝܫܘܥ *ܐܡܪܘ
ܒܟܬ̈ܒܐ[14] ܡܩܕ̈ܫܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܘܡܝܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ
ܘܡܝܬ. ܘܠܘ ܚܪܢܐ[7] ܗܘ[12] ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ. ܠܐ ܓܒܪ ܡܕܚܝܢ

---

[1] B C ܘܠܐ. [2] B ܠܘ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܗܘ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܡܝܬ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܐܬ, (C writes ܐܚܪܢܐ and ܘܐܚܪܢܐ). [3] B C ܐܚܪܢܐ. [4] B ܡܛܠ. [5] B C ܘܐܚܪܢܐ. [6] C ܠܘ. [7] B C ܐܚܪܢܐ. [8] B ܒܪܢܫܐ. [9] C ܐܬܡܣܪ. [10] B ܗܘܝܘ ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ. [11] B ܒܟܠ. [12] B omits. [13] B ܕܡܬܝܠܕ. [14] B C ܐܡܪ ܒܟܬ̈ܒܐ.

ܒܪܐ ܕܠܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ. *ܘܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ[1]
ܗܘ. ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܬܕܥܠ ܐܘ ܥܒܕܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ
ܐܝܟܢ ܫܠܝܡ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܐܦ ܒܡܘܠܕܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܐܢ ܐܡܪ ܘܐܦܠܐ
ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܝܠܕܐ ܕܢܦܫܬ ܐܠܗܐ. ܡܬܗܦܟܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ
ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܕܢܬܝܠܕ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܬܝܠܕ *ܡܢ
ܐܢܬܬܐ[2] ܒܪ ܠܒ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܒܡܘܠܕܗ ܩܕܡܝܐ.
ܠܓܒܪ ܡܕܡ[3] ܐܦ ܡܘܬܐ ܒܓܫܡܗ. ܒܪ ܠܒ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܚܝܐ ܒܟܝܢܗ. ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ
ܒܪܢܫܐ ܟܬܪ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܚܦ.
ܗܟܢܐ ܐܦ ܒܪ ܠܓܒܪ[4] ܡܘܬܐ ܕܣܠܩ ܠܐ ܐܘܒܕ
ܚܝܐ ܕܒܝܬܗ. ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܫܠܝܡ.
ܘܚܝܐ[5] ܗܘ ܕܠܓܒܪ ܡܘܬܐ *ܟܠ ܙܒܢܝܢ.[6] ܠܐ
ܠܓܘܝܗ ܐܘ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܐ ܒܩܠܐ[7] ܕܡܠܝܢ[8] ܥܡܥܡܐ[9]
ܡܘܕܥܢܐ. ܘܐܫܬܪܪ ܠܢ. ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܝܠܕܐ ܕܢܦܫܬ
ܐܠܗܐ. ܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܥܒܕܬ *ܡܚܝܘܗܝ ܗܕܐ.[10] ܦܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ[11]
ܦܬܓܡܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܕܢܬܝܠܕ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܐܢ ܒܪ
ܠܒܪ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܘܒܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘܝ ܡܕܡ ܐܦ ܒܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
ܚܝܐ ܡܚܝܬ ܒܓܝܢܗ.[12] ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܚܝܘܬܐ ܡܚܬ ܫܠܝܡ ܐܘ *ܒܪ

---

[1] B ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܘ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ ܘܠܐ (C ܕܠܘ inst. of ܘܠܐ). [2] B ܐܠܗܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ.
[3] B omits. [4] B adds ܓܝܪ. [5] B ܘܚܝܐ, C ܘܚܝܐ. [6] C ܙܒܢܝܢ. [7] B ܡܠܐ.
[8] C ܕܡܠܝܢ. [9] B ܡܓܘܡܠܐ, C ܡܓܘܡܠܐ. [10] C ܗܕܐ ܡܚܝܘܗܝ.
[11] C omits, B adds ܐܢܫ. [12] B omits.

ܐܢܫܐ.[1] ܕܟܠ[2] ܡܫܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܢܬ ܣܠܩ ܢܦܫܗ ܡܬܢܬ. ܘܟܠ
ܫܘܫܛܐ ܕܫܐܛ[3] ܣܠܩ ܠܦܫܛܗ ܫܐܛ. ܘܟܠ ܕܠܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،[4] ܘܗ̇ܘܐ̣[5] ܣܠܩ ܢܦܫܗ ܗ̇ܘܐ. ܗܘܪܟܐ ܕܝܢ ܪܒ
ܪܐܐ[6] ܘܡܛܝܡ ܣܘܟܐ.[7] ܘܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠ ܦܘܪܫܐ. ܕܗ̣ܘܐ
ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،. ܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܗ̣ܘ ܢܗܘܐ. ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘܐ
ܚܢܢ܆ ܐܠܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܗܘܢܗ ܒܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ.
ܘܠܡܬܒܥ ܕܗ̣ܘܐ̇ ܠܘ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܗ̣ܘܐ. ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠܬܢ. ܠܘ
ܚܢܢ ܫܘܫܛܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܚܝܘܗ. ܐܦ ܕܝܢ[8] ܟܕ ܫܘܫܛܐ ܗ̣ܘ
ܫܛ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܫܛ. ܐܦܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܐ ܗ̣ܘܐ. ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܕܢܒܐ
ܕܒܛܢ ܗܘܦܟܐ ܐܒܘܬܟ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܐ ܗ̣ܘ[3] ܡܛܠ
ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗ̣ܘ. *ܐܦܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܙܕܪܥ ܡܢ ܒ̈ܬܘܠܬܐ
ܗ̣ܘܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܬܠܡܝ̈ܕܐ ܒܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܕܒܬܪ
ܢܦܠܘܪ܆ ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܐ ܡܛܠ
ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗ̣ܘ.[9] ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܠܗ ܒܪܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܒܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܡܒܢܐ. ܕܡܪܝܐ[10] ܐܢܬ ܐܠܗܐ. ܡܪܝܐ ܐܢܬ
ܫܠܝܛܐ. ܡܪܝܐ ܐܢܬ ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܐ. ܕܐܬܡܠܟܬ ܫܠܝܡ
ܐܬܪܘܡ ܒܠܝ. *ܗܘ ܗܒܠ ܡܪܝܐ ܫܠܝܛܐ ܐܠܗܐ
ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܐ ܕܐܬܡܠܟܬ ܫܠܝܡ.[3] ܘܗܒܢܐ ܡܫܘܫܒܢܐ

---

[1] B C. [2] C. [3] B omits. [4] B adds ܗܘܐ. [5] C. [6] B C. [7] B. [8] B. [9] B omits which is due probably to the homoeoteleuton; C inserts after and writes. [10] B, in C no longer legible.

ܒܛܘܒܬܐ ܕܫܪܝܪܐ. ܘܫܒܚܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܠܫܪܒܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܪܝܪܐ
ܡܬܬܪܝܡܝܢ.[1] ܚܕܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܒܟܝܢܗ
ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ. ܐܢܓܠܝܐ ܒܫܘܪ ܣܠܩ ܥܠ. ܘܠܗ ܡܫܒܚܝܢ
ܐܘ *ܟܪ ܐܡܪܐ[2] *ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ ܐܬܬܠܝ[3] ܒܝܠܗ. ܠܠܐ[4]
ܡܬܩܢܝܢܐ[5] *ܣܝܡ ܐܢܫܝܢ.[6] ܠܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܐ ܠܥܠܡ[7]
ܣܡ[8] ܠܠܐ ܡܬܐܡܠܠܢܐ *ܐܡܠܝܢ ܣܡ.[9] ܠܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܐ
Fol. 122 v. *ܥܠܝܡ ܣܡ.[10] ܠܐܢܫܝܢ ‖ ܒܠ[11] *ܚܫܝܫܝܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ.[12] ܠܠܐ
ܡܫܝܚܐ *ܡܚܫܝܫܝܢ ܣܡ.[13] ܒܠܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܐ *ܡܬܚܫܝܫܝܢ ܣܡ[14]
ܕܡܬܚ ܣܠܩܝܢ. ܒܠܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܫܪ ܡܬܠܠܬܐ.
> ܡܟܪܙܝܢ[15] ܠܗܘܢ ܠܡ ܠܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܒܪܝܫܝܬ. ܐܡܝܪ[16]
> ܘܗܢܝܢ ܒܐܬܪܘܬܗ: ܗܘ ܕܫܡܝܢ ܘܚܝܠܝ[17] ܒܬܪܝܢ. ܣܝܡ
> ܘܥܡ ܒܐܬܪܝܢ. ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܠܟܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ. ܘܫܡܝܐ
> ܐܬܚܠܝܗ. ܘܣܝܡ ܘܡܫܬܡܫܝܢ. ܘܡܟܪܙܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܫܡܝܐ
> ܕܠܥܠܡ. ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܘܘ[18] ܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ ܘܐܬܚܠܝܘ
ܠܡ. ܫܡܫܬܗܘܢ، ܠܗܘܢܐ ܫܠܝܚܐ ܡܢ ܐܪܙܘܗܝ،[19] ܕܡܫܡܫܢܐ
ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܡܟܪܙ[20] ܠܝ ܥܠ ܫܪܪܐ. ܘܡܢܐ ܠܘܬܟ ܕܫܡܝܐ
ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ ܐܬܚܠܝܘ: ܘܗܘ ܕܠܐ
ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ. ܘܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܡܫܟܚ ܗܘܐ

[1] C ܡܬܬܪܝܡܝܢ. [2] C ܒܪܢܫܐ. [3] B ܡܢܗ ܠܒܪ ܐܬܬܠܝ. [4] B ܠܐ. [5] C ܡܬܩܢܝܢܐ. [6] B ܣܝܡܝܢ, C ܣܝܡ ܣܡ. [7] B ܠܥܠܡ. [8] C ܐܢܫܝܢ, B omits. [9] B ܐܡܠܝܢ. [10] B ܥܠܝܡ. [11] C ‖ ܒܠ. [12] B ܚܫܝܫܝܢ, C ܚܫܝܫܝܢ. [13] B C ܡܚܫܝܫܝܢ. [14] B ܡܬܚܫܝܫܝܢ. [15] C ܐܢܫܝܢ ܡܟܪܙܝܢ. [16] B C ܐܡܪ. [17] B ܘܚܝܠܘܗܝ. [18] B omits. [19] C ܐܪܙܘܗܝ. [20] C ܡܟܪܙ, B omits from ܠܡ l. 14 to ܠܐܬܚܠܝܘ l. 16.

ܐܬܚܫܒ. ܘܕܠܐ *ܡܬܓܠܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܐܬܓܠܝ.¹ ܘܗܘ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܝܬܝܪܐ² ܐܬܡܠܠ. *ܠܡܦܩ ܚܒܪܐ ܐܝܬ³
ܕܬܚܫܒ. ܐܘ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ.⁴ ܠܗܢܐ ܫܠܝܡܐ ܒܪ ܐܢܫ⁵
ܕܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ.¹ ܐܘ ܠܦܝܠܣܘܦܐ⁶ ܦܘܪܐ ܘܩܕܡ⁷ ܘܠܦܘܗܝ
ܙ̈ܒܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܣܘܪܝܐ⁸ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܥܠ
ܗܟܠ⁹ ܘܦܫܝܪ ܣܠܩܝܢ. ܣܡ ܕܝܢ ܒܣܪ ܡܣܬܒܪܐ¹⁰ *ܐܠܗܐ
ܡܠܬܐ¹¹ *ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܣܡ.¹² ܕܣܝܡܬ ܘܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܐܬܓܒܠ. ܘܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ. ܘܡܬܪ ܒܣܘܗ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܠܦܢܝܐ ܒܬܪ ܣܘܠܩܗ ܕܐܘܓܒܐ¹³
ܕܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܐܬܓܒܠ.¹⁴ ܐܠܐ ܠܗ ܡܢܗ. ܐܠܐ
*ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܐܢܫ¹⁵ ܕܒܗ ܘܡܢܗ ܘܠܘ ܡܢ ܐܚܪܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܓܒܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܓܠܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܐܠܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܢܓܒܐ ܘܗܘܐ. ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܢ ܙܪܥܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܕܘܝܕ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܠܦܝܢ ܒܬ̈ܒܐ. ܘܐܫܠܡܘ¹⁶ ܠܢ ܡܠܦܢܘ̈ܗܝ¹⁷ *ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܗܝ
ܕܫܪܝܪܬܐ.¹⁸ ܘܐܦܠܐ¹⁹ ܬܘܒ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ،
ܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܘܢܦܩ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ²⁰
ܢܣܛܘܪ²¹ ܪܫܝܥܐ. ܘܗܘ ܗܘܐ ܒܠܗܘܢ ܕܒܢܝܗ ܡܫܝܚܐ
ܗܘܐ ܘܐܢܫ ܗܘܐ²² ܐܝܟ ܕܟܬܒ ܒܣܦܪܐ. ܠܗ ܗܘܢܐ

---

¹ B omits. ² B ܝܬܝܪܬܐ C ܝܬܝܪܐ. ³ B ܠܡܦܩ ܚܒܪܐ, C ܘܠܡܦܩ ܚܒܪܐ
⁴ C ܡܗܝܡܢܐ. ⁵ B C ܐܢܫܗ. ⁶ B ܠܦܝܠܣܘܦܘܣ, C ܠܦܝܠܣܘܦܘܣ.
⁷ B ܘܩ̈ܕܡܝܐ. ⁸ B C ܕܣܘܪܝܐ. ⁹ B ܗܟܠ. ¹⁰ C ܐܠܗܐ. ¹¹ B ܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ
C ܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ. ¹² B C ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ. ¹³ B ܕܐܘܓܐ. ¹⁴ C adds ܘܐܬܒܪܢܫ.
¹⁵ B C ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ. ¹⁶ B ܘܐܫܠܡܘ. ¹⁷ C ܡܠܦܢܘܗܝ. ¹⁸ B ܕܫܪܝܪܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ.
¹⁹ B C ܐܦܠܐ. ²⁰ B C ܕܐܡܪ. ²¹ B ܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ, C ܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ. ²² C omits.

ܡܫܪܪ ܫܪܪܐ ܘܡܣܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ. ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܫܠܝܚܐ
ܒܪܢܫܐ[1] ܢܫܝܐ[2] ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܙܒܢܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܛܠ
ܒܗܠܝܢ. ܘܡܛܠ ܠܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ.
ܘܡܢ ܚ̈ܝܠܐ ܡܬܡܛܝܢܐ ܘܠܦܠܚܐ ܗܢܐ. ܕܐܦ ܗ̇ܘ
ܒܬܫܒܘܚܬܗܘܢ ܓܒܐ ܘܐܬܒܚܪ ܐܠܗܐ ܚܕܬܐ. ܘܠܘܬܗ ܗ̇ܘ،
ܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܗ̇ܢܐ
ܠܐܠܗܐ ܚܕܬܐ[3] *ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ[4] ܕܐܬܓܠܝ ܡܢ ܐܢܬܬܐ.[5]
ܠܗ ܡܟܝܠ *ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ[4] ܐܬܝܠܕ ܘܐܬܦܫܛ ܘܗ̇ܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܐܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܓܠܝ، ܘܐܬܡܣܟܢ ܘܐܬܚܫܒ.[6] ܘܗ̇ܘܐ
ܒܪܢܫܐ.[7] ܘܡܛܠܠ[8] ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܟܝܢܗ: *ܘܠܗ
ܕܐ[9] ܠܐ ܐܬܘܬܗ، ܗ̇ܘܐ[10] ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܦ[11] ܕܐ ܗ̇ܘܐ
ܒܪܢܫܐ[12] ܠܐ[13] ܐܫܬܚܠܦ. ܐܠܐ ܟܠܗ ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܟ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܡܬܚܫܒ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ. ܚܕܐ ܗ̇ܝ[14]
ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܬܥܝܐ. ܦܘܫܘ[15] ܠܡ ܬܠܡܝܕܘ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ
ܥܡ̈ܡܐ. ܘܐܥܡܕܘ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܫܡ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ
ܕܩܘܕܫܐ. ܚܕ ܐܒܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܫܡܗ ܐܒܐ ܢܫܝܐ.[2] ܘܚܕ[16]
ܒܪܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܫܡܗ ܒܪܐ ܢܫܝܐ.[2] ܘܚܕ ܪܘܚܐ[17]
ܕܠܝܬ ܒܫܡܗ ܪܘܚܐ ܢܫܝܐ.[2] ܠܝܬ *ܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܕ.[18] ܘܢܫܝܐ[19]

[1] C ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ. [2] B C ܐܢܫܝܐ. [3] B omits. [4] B C ܒܪܢܫܐ. [5] C ܒܬܘܠܬܐ.
[6] C adds ܘܐܬܡܟܢ. [7] B ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ. [8] B ܡܛܠ, C ܘܡܛܘܠ.
[9] B ܕܐܦ ܡܢ. [10] B omits, C ܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ. [11] B ܘܐܦ. [12] C ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ.
[13] B ܘܠܐ. [14] C adds ܗܘܝܘ. [15] B ܦܘܫ (sic). [16] B ܡܢ. [17] B adds
ܡܫܝܚܐ. [18] B ܚܡ (sic). [19] C B ܘܐܢܫܝܐ.

ܒܬܪ ܚܙܝܐ.[1] ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢܗܘܢ. ܚܕ ܗܘ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܝܬ
ܠܗ ܦܠܓܘܬܐ. ܒܪܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܙܒܢܐ. ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܡܬܝܕܥܐ
ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܒܬܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܘܒܪܐ. ܗܢܐ ܗܘ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܘܡܫܒܚܬܐ. ܕܒܗ̇ *ܡܗܝܡܢ ܚܢܢ.[2] ܘܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ̇
ܠܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܗ̇ ܡܕܡ. || ܘܟܠܡܕܡ ܕܡܬܒܥܐ ܐܘ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ Fol. 123 r.
ܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ̇ ܡܬܝܕܥ ܗܘ. ܗܠܝܢ ܡܪܘܡܐܝܬ ܒܬܒܬ
ܠܗܘܢ ܐܘ ܡܕ̈ܡܐ ܒܢܝ ܦܠܓܘܬܗ[3] ܕܒܪܝܐ. ܠܘ ܒܕ ܡܠܦ
ܐܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܒܕ ܡܫܘܚܐ ܐܢܐ ܥܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܬܗ̇,[4]
ܕܠܬܠܬܗܘܢ. ܗ̇ܝ *ܕܡܬܩܪܝܐ ܐܢܐ[5] ܕܒܗ̇ ܡܢ ܚܝ̈ܐ *ܣܠܩ
ܚܝ̈ܘܗ̇[6] ܐܢܫܐ. ܘܕܒܫܘܬܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ[7] ܣܠܩ ܗܢܐ ܥܒܪܐ
ܕܡܘܕܐ[8] ܒܗ ܐܬܘܪܒ. ܘܐܦ[9] ܠܗܘܢ ܬܘܒ[10] ܡܩܫܐ
ܐܢܐ ܕܬܗܘܘܢ ܫܠܝܛܝܐ[11] ܘܡܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܒܦܘܡܐ ܦܬܝܚܐ
ܠܥܝܪܐ.[12] ܘܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܐ ܬܬܟܣܘܢ. ܘܠܐ ܬܬܚܙܘܢ
ܡܢ ܦܠܓܐ ܘܬܬܒܥܐ ܕܣܦܩܗܘܢ. ܘܬܬܡܪܘܢ ܕܒܠܝܐ
ܕܕܘܒܪ̈ܝܢ *ܡܢܦܢ ܚܢܢ.[13] ܥܒܝܕܝܢ ܕܘܒܪ̈ܐ. ܥܒܝܕܝܢ ܒܡ̈ܠܐ
ܕܕܝܫܘܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܗܕ̈ܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܝܗܘܢ ܪܥܝܢܗܘܢ
ܥܒܪܐ. ܘܐܦ *ܡܬܦܫܫ ܪܢܝܐ[14] ܐܬܚܫܠܘ ܗܕ̈ܝܐ. ܘܠܐ
*ܬܘܒ ܐܢܫ[15] ܒܐܝܡܪ ܕܡܫܡܘܬܗ̇, ܠܗܘ̇, ܢܬܪ ܐܢܐ. ܠܐ

---

[1] B C ܐܢܫܐ. [2] B ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ, C ܡܢܗ ܠܐܢܫܝܢ ܡܢܗ ܘܠܒܪ ܡܗܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܚܢܢ. [3] B ܦܠܓܘܬܗ. [4] B ܕܡܫܘܚܘܬܐ. [5] B ܕܡܬܩܪܝܢ.
[6] B ܠܚܝ̈ܐ, (C ܚܝ̈ܐ inst. of ܚܝ̈ܘܗ̇). [7] B omits. [8] C ܐܢܐ ܕܡܘܕܐ.
[9] B C ܐܦ. [10] C omits. [11] B ܫܠܝ̈ܛܐ. [12] B ܠܥܝܪܐ ܚܪܝܪܐ. [13] B ܡܦܢܝܢ.
[14] B ܡܬܦܫܫܐ ܪܢܝܐ. [15] B ܐܢܫ ܬܘܒ.

ܟܕ ܡܬܚܦܛܝܢ [1] ܠܘܬܢ ܗܟܢܐ * ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܬ [2] ܕܐܒܝܕܐ
ܒܚܝܪܐ * ܘܡܬܗܡܨܐ ܐܝܬ. [3] ܐܝܟ ܗܘ, [4] ܟܕ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܕܡܫܒܚܢܐ ܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܒܫܦܠܘܬܗ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܡܫܒܚܐ ܕܢܦܩ [5] ܒܚܬ
ܐܒܘܗ. ܘܐܦ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܟܠܢܫ ܕܐܦ [6] ܒܒܝܬܐ ܕܒܡܫܪܐ
ܒܗ ܫܠܝܛܐ ܢܘܪܐ. ܡܕܝܢ ܐܦ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܗܝ ܕܢܫܡܘܬܐ
ܕܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܟܝܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܗܘܘ ܡܫܝܚܝܐ [7]
ܘܪ̈ܘܚܐ ܒܠܐ ܠܢܘܪܐ. [4] ܡܛܠ ܐܦ ܥܠ ܒܢܝܢܐ [8] ܡܢ
ܪ̈ܒܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ. ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܫܠܡܘܗܝ, ܕܐܠܗܐ, ܐܝܟ
ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܫܠܡ. ܢܚܬ ܟܕ ܕܟܬܪ ܕܢܫܡܬ ܡܢ
ܠܘܬܗܘܢ ܪܟܒܘ [9] ܥܠ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܘܦܪܐܘܢ ܡܦܠܚܢܐ
ܘܡܫܠܡܢܐ. [4] ܐܝܟ ܕܡ ܡܦܠܚܐ ܐܝܟ. ܕܗܘܐ ܦܠܚܘܬܐ
ܦܬܟܪ ܠܘܬܗ, ܒܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܢܦܫ. ܘܠܗܘܢ ܐܠܗܐ
ܫܡܥܘ [10] ܘܢܘܗܪܐ. ܘܢܬܒܥ ܠܗܘܢ ܬܪܥܐ ܕܬܘܒܘܬܐ
ܕܢܬܘܕܒܘܢ [11] ܠܐܪܥܗ ܀ * ܡܫܝܪ ܢܦܘܪܫ ܘܐܦܘܠܘܢܐ
ܘܦܠܚܘܗܝ ܘܬܠܡܝܕܘܗܝ ܘܟܠ ܕܢܛܪ ܠܗܘܢ. ܘܟܠ
ܕܠܐ ܡܫܝܪ ܒܦܘܩܕܢܗ ܘܟܠܗܘܢ. ܘܟܡ ܕܠܐ ܡܚܘܐ
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܐܝܦܠܓ
ܫܠܡ. ܟܕ ܕܠܐ ܪܫܡ ܠܦܪ̈ܝ ܥܡܘܕ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܫܪܪ ܀

[1] C adds. ܐܠܗܘܬܗ. [2] B ܕܐܝܬܝܬ. [3] B ܘܡܬܗܡܨܝܬ. [4] B omits. [5] B ܕܢܦܩ. [6] C omits. [7] B ܡܫܝܚܝܐ ; C ܡܫܝܚܐ. [8] B C ܒܢܝܢܐ. [9] B ܪܟܒ. [10] B adds ܠܗܘܢ. [11] B ܕܢܬܘܕܘܢ.

~ ∴ ܫܠܡܬ.[1] ∴ ~

[ܠܥܕܪܗ] [2] ܗܠܝܢ ܒܬܪ ܕܫܠܡܬܘܢ[3] ܒܫܠܡܐ. ܠܗܘܢ
ܐܦ ܒܬܫܡ̈ܫܬܐ ܫܪܝܪܬ ܠܟܘܢ. ܐܦ ܠܬܘܕܝܬܐ[4] ܡܛܪܐ ܕܠܐ
ܚܝܢ ܠܗ ܒܦܘܪ. ܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܡܢܟܠܝܗܘܢ ܕܬܫܡ̈ܫܬܐ
*ܐܦܝܣܩ. ܡܪܝ، ܐܡܪ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܗܘܐ ܕܗܢ ܢܦܫܗ ܘܐܬܪܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ
ܒܐܬܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܬܒܬܫ ܐܝܟ ܪܒܘ.[5] ܐܬܢܝܚܘ[6]
ܗܒܝܠ ܘܒܬܪܐ[7] ܗܘ ܕܡܣܪܐ ܢܗܘܐ[8] ܦܐܪܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܒܢ
ܒܚ̈ܝܠܐ ܕܐܝܡܢܘܬܐ. ܡܢ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܚܝܠܦ ܗܡܢܘܬܗ[9]
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܟܠ. ܕܠܗ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܠܥܠܡܝܢ ܐܡܝܢ.

---

[1] B C omits. [2] What follows is wanting in A, and is found only in B and C. [3] C adds ܡܚܣܢ. [4] C ܠܐܡܬܢܝܚ. [5] C omits. [6] C ܐܬܬܠܚܘ. [7] C ܘܐܚܝܢܐ. [8] C ܐܘ ܒܝ ܢܚܝܢ. [9] C ܗܡܢܘܬܐ.

B.

ܬܘܒ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܗ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܡܪܝ ܐܒܣܝܢܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܒܢܬ ܥܘ ܥܠ ܕܡܕܝܢܐ ܢܨܘܒܐ.

Vat. Syr. 135 fol. 19 v. ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܐܕܢܚ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܪܟܐ ܗܢܐ
ܠܥܡܡܐ ܕܡܗܝܡܢܐ. ܘܦܠܓܐ ܕܚܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܘܫܒ̈ܚܬܐ ܦܠܚܬܐ
ܗܐ ܡܬܒܪ̈ܢ ܘܡܢܗܐ ܥܠܘ ܒܢ̈ܝܬܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܐܬܓܠܝܬ
ܠܚܝܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܡܘܢ ܡܫܬܒܚܐ ܘܐܬܬܪܝܡ ܒܪܝܫܗ ܕܙܪܥܐ
ܡܢ ܥܠܡܘܢ ܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ. ܘܠܗ ܠܗܢܐ ܦܓܪܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܫܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܥܡ
ܡܠܠܐ ܘܡܫܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܢܫܝܢ. ܢܨܒܬ ܕܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܟܕ ܒܬܫ̈ܒܚܬܗ,
Fol. 20 r. a. ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ‖ ܐܪܝܡܘ ܘܐܘܪܒ ܠܫܘܒܚܗܘܢ. ܕܡܛܠ ܫܘܒܚܬܐ
ܕܡܫܪ̈ܬܐ. ܢܬܡܪ̈ܢ ܒܢܝܫܗܘܢ ܒܬܫ̈ܒܚܬܗ, ܥܬܝܕܬܐ. ܠܗܬ
ܒܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܡܢ ܗܕܡܝܘܬܗ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܕܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܒܗ ܘܒܗ
ܒܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܬܟܠܠ. ܘܥܠ ܗܕܐ ܒܐܪܥܝܬܐ ܡܫܬܒܚܝܢ ܐܢܐ
ܠܗ ܠܡܠܬܗ܇ ܕܐܬܝܗܒ ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ ܪܒܘܬܗ ܗܘ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܗ
ܒܢܝܐ. ܐܚܪܬ, ܚܝܠ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܥܒܕ ܘܪܒܐ ܡܫܠܡ.
ܠܡܫܒܚܘ ܒܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܗܘܢ. ܐܝܟܢ
ܗܝܠ ܐܘ ܐܚܝܗ, ܪܘܚܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܡܢ
ܚܫܒܘܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܗ ܠܚܘܒܐ ܗܢܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܓܝܪ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܬܡܠܝܢ ܒܡܠܝܗܘܢ. ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܩܒܠ

ܠܟܠܗ ܕܒܡܪܕܘܬܗܘܢ ܡܕܝܢܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܬܡܗ
ܘܡܬܕܡܪ ܒܡܫܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܠܝܢܝܗܘܢ. ܕܣܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ
ܫܡܥܗ ܕܕܘܒܪܗܘܢ ܠܚܠܡܘܢ ܕܦܝܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܡܚܒܕܝܢ ܒܩܘܡ
ܡܣܬܠܐ ܡܢ ܠܓܒܐ ܕܟܬܒܝܢܗܘܢ ܣܬܠܘܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܐܢܚܢܐ
ܕܢܚܙܝܢ ܡܢ ܥܡܠܐ ܕܣܠܝܘܬܗܘܢ. ܩܒܠܐ ܡܬܠܒܒܝܢ
ܣܬܠܘܢܐ ܕܡܚܕܝܢ ܒܠܒܢܐ ܕܟܬܒܝܢܗܘܢ. ܐܝܟ ܡܠܟܐ ܓܝܪ
ܠܡܐܒܘܠܘܬܐ. ܗܒܢܐ ܐܢܬܘܢ، ܥܒܕܘܢ ܡܥܕܪܢܐ
ܠܚܠܡܘܢ ܦܬܢܗܐ. ܘܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܩܪܒ ܣܥܘܒܐ ܡܢ ܢܘܗܪܐ.
ܩܒܠܐ ܡܢ ܥܡܠܐ ܕܣܠܝܘܬܗܘܢ ܓܝܬܪܐ ܒܠܗ
ܦܘܪܥܢܘܬܐ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܥܒܕܝܗܘܢ ܠܟܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܡܚܠܒܘܢ ‖ ܐܠܐ Fol. 20 r. *b.*
ܣܘܟܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܠܘ ܒܐܡܣܩܢܐ
ܡܬܩܠܣܝܢ ܠܟܬܒܗܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܒܥܒܪܐ ܕܢܓܝܚܐ ܥܒܕܐ. ܠܘ
ܓܝܪ ܠܦܘܫܩܗ ܕܕܝܘܬܐ ܒܠܫܢܗ ܠܥܝܒܘܬܢ. ܐܠܐ ܗܘ
ܥܪܘܩܗ ܕܕܝܘܬܐ ܡܛܝܒ ܒܡܣܒܪܢܘܬܗܘܢ. ܥܒܕܢܐ ܠܟܠܐ
ܐܢܬܘܢ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܒܢܝܬ ܬܠܬܒܪܐ ܒܠܗܘܢ. ܘܕܠܐܘܢ ܐܝܟ
ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܬܬܠܝܪܘ ܕܘܒܪܗܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܦܐ. ܦܘܪܥܢܘܬܐ
ܓܝܪ ܕܟܠ ܐܦܣܩܘܡܝܢ ܢܬܠܬ ܠܡܫܬܩܠܘ. ܟܠ ܠܘܫܒܐ
ܫܠܡܐ ܕܟܬܒܝܢܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܓܒܬ ܢܬܦܘܢ. ܘܗܘܦܟ ܦܪܥܢܐ
ܗܘ ܕܡܓܒ ܒܐܝ ܒܚܠܐ ܕܐܫܬܝܬ. ܟܠ ܠܥܒܕܘܢ ܕܠܗܘܢ
ܠܐ ܐܫܬܟܠܠ. ܘܠܐ ܕܫܠܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ: ܐܦܠܐ
ܥܘܦܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܦܪܥܢܐ ܐܫܬܠܛܬ ܒܗܘܢ. ܠܐ
ܫܠܛܘܢܗ، ܠܦܪܥܐ ܒܕܝܢܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ. ܘܠܐ ܬܫܬܥܘܢ

ܡܢ [1] ܠܡܢܫ ܕܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܐ. ܡܛܠ ܡܫܘܡܫܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܗܐ [2]
ܐܬܬܢܝܚܘ. ܠܐ ܐܬܬܘܗܝ، ܒܡܬܪܥܘܬ ܠܡܬܪܐ ܐܝܟ
ܫܪܒܐ ܕܐܣ̈ܝܐ ܕܟܠ ܗܕܐ ܡܬܒܥܝܢ. ܠܐ ܕܒܬܘܬܒܘܗܝ،
ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܫܘܥܒܐ ܕܫܡܪܐ ܘܡܫܬܢܝܐ ܕܠܫܡܥܐ ܐܝܟ
ܫܪܒܐ ܕܐܣ̈ܝܐ. ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܠܫ̈ܦܪܐ ܘܒܗܘܢ. ܡܗܕܐ ܠܒܪ
ܒܬܠܬܝܢ ܕܫܢܝܐ ܒܬܪ ܕܡܢܗ. ܘܗܠܝܢ ܬܠܡ̈ܝܕܐ
Fol. 20 v. *a.* ܕܫܡܥܘܢ. ܒܡܕܡ ܕܥܒܕ ܘܡܫܠܡ ܗܝ ܡܢ || ܗܕܐ ܒܠܘܚܕ ܡܕܒܪܝܢ
ܠܗ. ܘܐܝܟܐ ܕܡܬܒܥܐ ܐܬܬܘܗܝ. ܡܫܬܒܚܐ ܗܘ ܕܪܒܘܗ
ܘܠܘ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܫܠܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܒܘܗܝ ܗܘ، ܕܒܬܒܥܐ ܡܢ
ܦܘܠܘܣ: ܕܐܠܗܘܗܝ ܫܪܝܘܗܝ ܘܬܫܒܘܚܬܗܘܢ
ܒܬܫܬܗܘܢ. ܘܬܘܒ ܐܡܪ ܕܒܬܪܥܘܬܗܘܢ ܒܠܗ ܒܐܪܒܐ
ܗܝ. ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐܪܒܐ ܐܬܒܠܥܘ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܡܝܐ. ܘܟܠ ܗܕܐ
ܦܪܫܘܗܝ ܒܠܗ ܠܘܬ ܐܪܥܢܘܬܐ ܢܦܫ. ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܦܫܠ
ܕܒܚܢ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܐܪܐ ܒܗ: ܠܐ ܡܦܩܕܪܐ ܢܦܫܗ ܕܠܐ
ܫܐܠ ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܢܦܫ ܠܦܘܪܫܐ ܕܒܠܘܗܝ. ܐܒܘܢܐ ܠܒܪ
ܕܒܢܝܢܝܬ ܫܐܠ ܦܪ̈ܘܩ: ܐܘ ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܦܪܓܠܐ
ܐܘ ܕܒܐܦܐ: ܐܘ ܕܟܕܡ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܬܦܘܪ ܠܗ: ܦܢܝܐ
ܫܐܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ. ܡܟܐ ܕܦܓܪܐ ܒܗ ܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ
ܘܦܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܘܐܝܕܐ ܗܝ ܦܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܪܒܐ

---

[1] The ms. has ܡܢ twice, at the end of the line and again at the beginning of the following line.

[2] So the ms.

ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܝܗܘ̈ܕܝܐ ܚܕ̈ܬܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܐ. ܕܐܦ̈ܝ
ܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܦ̈ܝ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ. ܘܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ ܐܡܪܘܗ.
ܘܡܬܬܣܝܡ ܒܥܒܕܘܗ. ܘܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܘܬܗ: ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܢܬ
ܘܥܒܕ ܐܢܬ ܢܦܫܟ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܡܬܒܝܢܝܢ || ܕܢܣܒܘܟ ܕܠܝܬ Fol. 20 v. *b.*
ܠܗ ܐܡܪܐ ܕܢܩܛܠܘܗ. ܐܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܬܐ ܢܫܟܚܘܗ
ܡܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܟܕ ܢܩܫܘܗ. ܐܠܐ
ܫܪܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܥܒܕ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܥܠ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܠܒܪ
ܡܡܠܠܝܢ ܥܒܪܐ ܥܠ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܘܠܐ ܩܛܠܘܗܝ. ܫܘܒ ܠܒܪ
ܕܡܬܩܪܒܝܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܠܐ ܐܬܬܨܝܒ. ܦܬܓܡܐ ܐܝܟ.
ܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܝܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܦ. ܐܠܐ ܒܫܘܝܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܟܢ ܗܘܐ ܡܢܗ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܬܨܝܒ ܒܠܘܩܒ. ܠܘ ܡܢ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܡܬܐܡܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܠܘ ܦܓܪܐ ܢܣܒ. ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܢܦܩ. ܠܘ ܠܒܪ
ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܘ ܕܦܓܪܐ ܕܢܣܒ. ܐܠܐ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ
ܢܣܒ ܒܡܬܥܒܕܢܘܬܗ ܠܚܝܝܢ ܥܒܕܐ. ܠܘ ܕܢܒܒ ܐܠܗܐ
ܐܬܐ ܠܒܪܢܫܐ. ܐܠܐ ܕܢܬܚܒܒ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ. ܠܒܢܝܢܗ
ܠܒܪ ܕܟܠܗ ܐܬܪܐ. ܠܘ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ.
ܐܠܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ || ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܫܠ. ܒܕܡ Fol. 21 r. *a.*
ܟܠܗܘܢ. ܐܬܝܠܕ ܠܒܪ ܦܓܪܢܝܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܠܘ ܒܗܝ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܡܢ
ܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܬܡܢ ܫܘܪܝܐ. ܒܗܝ ܠܒܪ

ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܦܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܥܙܪ. ܒܡܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܗܘܐ
ܐܢܫ. ܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܥܒܕܐ ܡܢ
ܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܥܒܕܐ ܐܝܟ
ܐܠܗܐ. ܗܘ ܗܘܐ ܬܫܡܫܬ ܥܒܕܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܗܘ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܪܘܚܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܢܐ: ܘܠܒܫ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܟ
ܐܠܗܐ: ܗܘ ܗܘܐ ܦܓܪܐ ܘܡܬܚܙܢܐ ܒܗ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܗܘ ܕܢܓܪ ܘܚܟܠ. ܘܡܬܓܠܐ ܘܡܬܪܒܒ: ܘܣܒܪܐ
ܒܥܠܐ ܣܬ̈ܪܐ ܒܗ ܒܪܘܚܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ. ܗܘ ܕܐܬܬܓܪ
ܘܐܬܓܠܠ ܘܗܘܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܡܘܡܐܐܬ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܘܗܘ ܕܡܬܝܪܬܐ ܠܟܠ ܘܡܥܒܕܐ ܘܡܬܒܪܐ: ܘܠܒܫ ܘܐܬܚܙܝ
ܘܡܬܠܗ ܠܟܠ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ: ܗܘ ܐܬܠܒܫ ܘܐܬܬܪܒ
ܘܐܬܥܬܠ ܠܗ ܕܝܢܐ ܘܠܘ ܫܠܡ. ܘܦܥܠ ܬܘܬܒܘܬܐ
Fol. 21 r. *b.* ܒܡܠܘܫܗ || ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܚܫܡ ܘܠܐ ܠܐܢܐ
ܘܠܐ ܕܚܝܢ: ܘܠܐ ܡܠܐܟܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ. ܗܘ ܚܫܡ ܘܠܥܝ
ܘܐܟܠ ܘܐܫܬܝ. ܘܢܡ ܘܕܡܟ. ܘܫܐܠ ܕܒܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܟ
ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܫܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܦܬܐ ܠܗ ܓܪܒܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦ ܒܝܘܡ ܠܡܬܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ. ܗܘ ܢܚܬ
ܘܐܬܓܠܕ ܘܐܬܠܚ ܥܒܕܐ. ܘܐܬܢܓܕ ܘܐܬܢܨ̈ܚ ܒܨܠܝܒܘܬܐ
ܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܗܘ ܕܒܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܥܒܘܕܐ
ܚܙ ܗܘ ܡܚܠܠ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ. ܗܘ ܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܕܪܐ ܠܬܠܬܐ
ܝܘܡܝܢ. ܒܗܘ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܗܘ ܪܚܡܐ ܚܘܪ ܘܡܚܠܠܗ
ܡܘܬܐ ܒܗ ܥܒܕ. ܢܘܚܡܐ ܠܟܠ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܗܘܐ.

ܘܫܠܝ ܥܡܡܐ ܘܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܒܪܡܫܗ ܡܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ.
ܒܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܥܡ̈ܡܐ ܘܡܦܪܢܣ ܗܘܐ ܡܕ̈ܒܪܐ. ܘܢܦܫ
ܢܦ̈ܫܬܐ ܘܡܕܒܪ ܠܟܠ̈ܗܐ ܘܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܠܟܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܒܟܠ ܕܘܟܐ. ܪܐܙܐ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܡܫܬܒܚܝܢ.
ܘܠܐ ܟܠ ܓܒ̈ܘܬܐ. ܕܠܐ ܘܕܠܝܬ ܒܗܬܝܢ. ܠܬܗܘܡ ܓܒܪ
ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܢܫܐ. ܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܢܣܒ
ܦܓܪܐ. ܐܢܫܐ ܬܫܡܫܬ ܗ̣ܘ. ܘܐܢܫܐ ܦܓܪܐ ܕܢܣܒ.
ܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܚܬ ܒܗ̇، ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ‖ ܝܠܝܕ. ܘܒܗ̇، Fol. 21 v *a.*
ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܦܓܪܢܘܬܗ
ܦܠܓܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܒܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܚܫܝܫܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܠܬܪܝܢ
ܡܦܪ̈ܫܝܢ ܠܗ. ܚܕ ܗܘ ܐܦ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܕܐܬܒܣܪ. ܟܠ
ܒܘܪܟܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܟܠܗ ܒܘܪܟܐ
ܒܪܝܟ. ܘܠܘܬ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ. ܒܐܒܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܒܐ.
ܘܠܒܪܐ ܡܬܬܚܝܬܗ. ܘܒܝܬ ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܡܫܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܘܗܝ
ܘܒܪܢܫܐ ܒܕܡܘܬܗܘܢ. ܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܪܘܚܢܐ ܒܗ̇
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܪܘܚܢܐ. ܘܠܐ ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܗ̇، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܐܠܗܐ. ܠܝܬ ܠܗ ܥܘܪܢܐ. ܘܠܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܠܐ
ܥܘܪܢܐ ܒܗ̇، ܕܝܠܝܕ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ. ܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܢܣܒ
ܦܓܪܐ. ܡܒܥܬ ܡܛܠ ܕܗܘ̣ܐ ܣܒܪܐ ܠܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ. ܓܝܪ، ܡܢ
ܒܘܪܟܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܬܦܠܓ ܐܒܗܘܬ. ܡܘܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܘܚܕܐ
ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ̣ܐ ܐܢܫܐ. ܘܠܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܗܘ̣ܐ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ
ܘܚܫܐ ܠܟܝܢ ܡܘܬܐ. ܠܟܝܢ ܗܘ̣ܐ ܚܫܐ ܡܘܬܐ. ܡܛܠ

ܕܢܝܚܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ. ܗܘ̣ܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܕܢܗܘܘܢ
ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܦܫܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܗ̇ܝ
ܕܚܫ̈ܝܢ. ܘܩܘܪܒܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܠܗ ܟܠ ܐܢܫܐ ܩܕܡ ܐܠܗܐ.
Fol. 21 v. b. ܐܝܟ ܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ || ܗܘ̣ܐ. ܐܦ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ
ܘܚܝ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝ̈ܕܘܗܝ ܠܝ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܘܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܠܘ
ܓܝܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܢܫ̇ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܕܡܝܬ. ܐܠܐ ܗܘ̣ ܗ̇ܘ
ܕܡܝܬ ܐܢܫ ܒܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ. ܘܐܦ ܚܝ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܒܚܕ
ܡܥܡܟܐ ܐܬܪܗ ܠܫܠܡܟ. ܠܘ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܚܕ
ܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܗܡܝܢ ܕ̈ܝܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܟܐ
ܒܪ ܒܪܗ ܫܒܝܚܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܬܘܒ ܗ̣ܘ ܥܠܝܗ̇.
ܕܐܬܪܒ ܥܡܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܗ. ܘܬܘܒ ܐܡܪ̣
ܕܟܠ ܒܪܗ ܠܐ ܚܣ. ܐܠܐ ܐܫܠܡܗ ܚܠܦ ܟܠܢ. ܗ̇ܘ
ܗ̇ܟܝܠ ܕܠܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܕܡܝܬ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܦ ܠܐ ܕܡܝܬ
ܒܪܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܗܝܡܢ. ܘܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܗ̣ܘ ܕܡܠܟܘܬܗ
ܕܦܠܛܘ. ܐܢ ܒܪܐ ܓܝܪ ܗ̣ܘ ܡܥܝܢܐ ܗ̣ܘ ܚܝ̈ܝܐ
ܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܒܗ̇ܝܢܐ ܘܬܢܝܐ ܕܡܝܬ. ܗ̣ܝ ܗ̣ܝ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܝܬ. ܗ̣ܝ
ܓܝܪ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܬܐ. ܕܝܢܐ ܗ̣ܝ
ܕܒܪܐ ܗ̣ܘ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܗ̣ܘ ܒܪܐ
ܘܐܢܫܐ ܡܠܬܐ. ܘܡܠܘܗܝ ܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܒܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܥܠܝܗ̇.
Fol. 21 r. a. ܕܐܬܝܗܒ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ ܀ ܗ̇ܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܦܩܕ || ܡܢ ܥܡܡܐ
ܕܡܗܝܡܢܐ. ܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢ ܕܒܪܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܗ̣ܘ ܀
ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܬܪ̈ܝܢ. ܠܐ ܦܠܓ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ܀

ܘܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘ ܫܒܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܫܠܝܐ
ܘܕܝܘܕܥܝܐ ܀ ܘܗܘ ܕܝܗܒ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܠܝܚܝܕ ܘܡܫܟܚܬܐ
ܠܐܘܪܫܠܡ . ܬܪܝܢ ܒܢܝ̈ܢ ܡܫܘܕܐ ܚܠܐܝܬ . ܘܦܘܪܫܢܐ
ܕܗܦܟܐ ܠܚܝܢ ܡܚܒܠܠ ܀ ܘܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܢܘܡܘܣܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ
ܐܬܚܒܪ[1] ܒܗ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܐܬܚܒܒܪ ܐܠܗܐ .
ܦܬܟܪܐ ܚܝܠ ܘܚܠܦܐ ܡܪܟܒ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܥܕܬܐ ܒܪܐ ܀
ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܪܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܣܬܪܩ ܘܢܦܩ ܕܡܘܬܐ
ܕܓܒܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܠܦ ܦܘܠܘܣ . ܠܐ ܝܗܒ ܠܗ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ
ܕܦܫܝܛܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢ ܕܝܚܝܕܝܗ
ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܝܗܒ ܥܠ ܦܘܪܩܢܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܒܚܘܒܗ
ܕܐܒܐ . ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܒܚܘܒܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܥܠܡܐ ܀
ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ .
ܠܐ ܢܣܒ ܚܐܪܘܬܐ ܘܚܕܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܡܥܡܘܕܝܬܐ . ܘܠܐ
ܒܕܚܠ ܐܬܦܪܩ ܡܢ ܚܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܠܘܛܬܐ
ܘܕܡܘܬܐ ܀ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܗ̇ܬ ܕܒܝܪܘܗܝ ‖ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܐ . Fol. 21*a* r. *b*.
ܡܚܫܒܬ ܠܗ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܡܢ
ܡܠܐ̈ܟܘܗܝ ܡܫܬ̈ܪܐ ܀ ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܐ̈ܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܕܠܐ
ܚܫܘܫܐ ܣܓܝ ܘܠܐ ܚܫܘܫܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܣܠܩܝ . ܣܦܩܐ ܗܘ
ܗܢܐ . ܘܠܐ ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܗܘ ܀ ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܕܡܫܝܚ
ܡܪܝܐ ܗ̣ܘ . ܕܡܢ ܚܠܦ . ܒܗ̇ܢܐ[1] ܐܝܟܘܗܝ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܝܬ

---

[1] So the ms.

ܒܗ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܡܢ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܐܬܥܒܕ ܫܘܒܚ ܡܪܝܐ
ܘܡܫܝܚܐ . ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܫܘܬܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ .
ܠܐܠܗܐ ܢܘܕܘܢܝܗ ܦܠܢ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܫܐܠܬ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܥܠ ܚܕ
ܡܫܝܚܐ : ܘܫܒܩ ܠܗ ܬܪܝܢ ܡܢܗܘܢ . ܐܘ ܬܪܝܢ ܒܢܝܢ
ܡܦܪܫ ܗܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܪܟܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܠܐ
ܐܬܡܢܥ ܒܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܦܘܪܐ
ܗܘ ܕܦܪܩܗ ܘܡܫܚ ܡܠܬܐ . ܗܘܝܘ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܟܒܗ ܡܛܠ
ܒܪ ܕܘܝܕ ܘܒܪ ܐܒܪܗܡ . ܗܢܐ ܒܡܫܝܚܘܬ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ
ܥܠܝܡܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܥܒܕ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܗܘ ܕܪܫܡ ܟܠܗܘܢ
ܕܒܪܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ : ܘܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ :
ܘܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ : ܠܘ ܗܘܝܘ ܚܠܦ ܕܚܠܝܐ ܗܘ
ܕܐܡܪ ܡܠܐܟܐ ܠܒܬܘܠܬܐ : ܕܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܒܟܪܣܐ . ܘܬܐܠܕܝܢ
ܒܪܐ . ܘܬܩܪܝܢ ܫܡܗ ܝܫܘܥ .‖ ܗܢܐ ܡܚܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܡܢ Fol. 21a v. a.
ܡܠܬܗ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܗܘܝܘ ܥܠ ܐܚܪܝܐ ܐܬܥܒܕ :
ܘܡܬܝ ܘܡܪܩܘܣ ܘܠܘܩܐ ܥܠ ܐܚܪܢܐ . ܗܢܐ ܢܘܟܪܝܐ
ܗܘ ܠܦܫܪܘܬܐ ܕܥ̈ܠܝܡܐ ܘܚܪܘܪܘܬܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ . ܟܕ ܕܐܡܪ
ܕܫܒܩܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܢ ܕܡܦܪܫܝܢ ܘܐܝܟܢ ܡܢ
ܫܪܪܐ ܡܟܬܒ : ܘܠܘ ܚܕ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܘܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ
ܕܐܬܓܠܝ ܘܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ . ܗܢܐ ܒܥܝܢ ܠܗ
ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ . ܘܒܪ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܀ ܟܕ
ܕܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ : ܐܠܗܐ
ܒܟܝܢܐ ܘܒܪܢܫܐ ܒܒܪܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܚܕ ܡܢܢ . ܘܠܐ ܡܟܝܢܐ

ܕܗܘܘ ܒܪ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܒܡܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܟ
ܒܒܪܝܐ ܘܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܐܟ̈ܐ. ܗܢܐ
ܕܒܟܠ ܒܪܝܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܣܠܝܬܐ ܘܝܐܪܘܬܐ ܕܒܣܪ ܡܫܝܚܐ
ܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܀ ܘܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܟܝܢ ܡܠܘܟܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܝܗܘܒܐ
ܘܫܘܒܚܐ ܐܝܬ ܒܗ: ܘܚܝܠܐ ܘܡܬܚܫܢܢܐ: ܘܠܐ ܡܘܪܐ
ܕܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܟܠܗ ܝܗܘܒܐ ܗܘ: ܘܡܟܠܠ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܬܐ
ܠܐܢܫܘܬܐ. ܒܝܘܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܟܠܐ ܀ ܘܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ
ܕܦܠܓܗ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܗܘ: ܘܦܠܓܗ ܡܬܦܪܩܢܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܦܪܩܢܐ ܕܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܗܘ ܟܠܗ: ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ || ܢܣܒ Fol. 21*a* v. *b*.
ܐܬܦܪܝ: ܕܡܬܦܪܩ ܦܘܪܩܢ. ܐܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܠܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܒܒܪ
ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܠܒܘܗ ܀ ܘܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
ܐܠܗܐ ܡܫܠܡܢܐ ܒܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ: ܘܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ
ܠܡܫܪܐ ܡܢ ܚܢܢܐ ܐܢܫܐ. ܒܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ ܠܐ
ܢܬܚܫܒ ܀ ܘܡܢ ܕܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܘܬܐ ܚܫܝܒܬܐ ܒܠܘܢ ܕܗܘܐ
ܒܦܘܡܗ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ: ܘܠܘ ܡܬܓܫܡܢܘܬܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ
ܒܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܢܘܡܐ. ܠܗܕܐ ܐܚܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܡܫܝܚܐ
ܠܝܬ ܠܗ ܀ ܘܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܢܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܪܝܐ ܒܦܓܪ
ܒܦܓܪܐ ܡܫܬܢܝܐ: ܐܝܟ ܕܐܦ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܘܪ̈ܢܝܢܐ ܒܦܓܪ
ܗܘܐ: ܘܠܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܐ ܡܫܬܢܝܢܐ ܐܝܟ
ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܒܪ ܗܘ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܬܢܝܢܐ ܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܠܐ ܒܕܒܝܠ ܟܠ ܡܢ ܦܓܪܐ ܕܐܬܚܫܒܬܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܕܐܬܒܛܘܗ
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܀ ܘܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܕܗܘ ܐܬܐܠܗܐ ܕܫܠܡ ܒܫܡ

ܠܘܩܒܠ ܒܥܠܕܪ̈ܐ ܡܩܪܒ. ܒܓܘ ܚܘܪܒܐ ܗܘܘ ܒܪ ܚܝܘ
ܕܐܟܐ: ܕܒܗ̇، ܕܗܘܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܡܪܟܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܒܥܠܕܪ̈ܐ
ܗܕ̈ܪ. ܐܠܐ ܡܫܒܪ ܕܐܬܠܝܛܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܘܣܝܦ ܐܠܗܐ
ܡܢ ܚܝܠ ܕܠܒܝܫ ܘܠܒܫܘܗܝ، ܕܟܐ ܗܘܐ. ܢܨܚܢܐ || ܗܘ Fol. 22 r. *a*
ܡܢ ܕܟܘܬܗ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܀ ܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܡܢ ܚܘܒܝ̈ܗܘܢ، ܐܘܪܕܢ
ܡܫܝܚܐ: ܘܒܩܘܠܣܐ ܕܡܬܥܒ̈ܕܬܗ ܗܘܐ ܒܪ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ
ܠܠܘܬܐ: ܘܠܘ ܒܚܝܠܗ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܚܠܝܐ ܘܐܠܗܐ. ܗܦܝܡ
ܗܘ ܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܡܐ ܡܫܪܝܘܬܐ. ܘܡܠܟܐ ܒܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ
ܕܐܒܠܡܪ̈ܝܐ ܀ ܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܦ
ܡܢ̈ܬܐ: ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܚܫܝ ܒܡܘܬܐ. ܡܘܬܗ
ܕܗܢܐ ܒܕܚܝܠ ܠܗ ܐܫܬܪ، ܀ ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܡܫܢ ܕܗܘ
ܕܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܬܬܚܝܕ ܡܢ ܡܘ̈ܕܝܐ: ܘܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܫܠܝܛܐ
ܐܬܕܒܪ: ܗܘܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܗ
ܚܝ̈ܠܐ ܡܪ̈ܚܠ ܗܘܐ. ܢܘܕܗ ܕܡܟܐܣ ܢܫܒܪ ܥܠ ܩܘܕ̈ܫ
ܫܘܒܚܗ، ܀ ܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܗܘ ܕܝܠܕ ܠܚܝܘ ܡܢ ܒܪܢܫܐ
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܘ: ܘܗܘ ܕܡܬܝܠܕ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܐܟܐ ܒܒܪܘ
ܫܡܗ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܘ: ܠܚܝܘ ܗܘ ܕܪܕܦ ܡܫܘܒ ܚܕܪ ܒܗ ܀
ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܦܪܕܐ ܕܩܪ̈ܡܬܐ ܘܡܫ̈ܬܬܐ ܕܝܫ ܒܪܐ ܐܬܝ̈ܬܘܒܗܝ
ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܫܪ ܡܘܩܒܠܐ ܘܫܪ ܒܝܢܐ ܕܐܬܓܠܝܡ. ܗܢܐ
ܥܒܕܐ ܗܘ ܡܫܥܒܕܢܐ ܀ ܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܗܘ ܘܗܢܐ ܒܚܕ
ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܗܢܐ ܒܕܚܝܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘ ܒܠܘܬܐ ܀ || ܡܢ ܕܠܐ Fol. 22 r. *b.*
ܡܦܪܫܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܒܪܐ. ܐܦ

ܐܢܐ ܚܒܪ ܐܢܐ: ܗܘܝܘ ܗܘ ܕܚܙܝܬ ܒܠܘܗܝ ܦܓܪܗ
ܕܒܝܬܝܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܬܪܝܡ. ܘܢܦܩ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܥܘܕܪܐ
ܕܟܠ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ. ܒܗܝܐ ܪܘܚܐ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܟܡܪܐ
ܒܗ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܦܓܪܗ ܕܡܪܝ. ܡܢ ܥܡܢܐ ܢܦܩܬ: ܒܡܢ
ܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܦܢܝܘ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܕܡܘܬܐ ܗ̈ܝ
ܕܟܠܬܐ ܣܓܝܗ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܟܢܫܢܘܬܐ ܕܩܘܫܬܐ
ܡܢܗ ܡܢ ܒܢܗ ܕܟܘܠܬܐ. ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܐܠ
ܘܕܫܪܝܗ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܐܫܬܐܠ
ܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܦܓܪܐ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ. ܘܡܢ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܣܝܪ ܡܦܕܐ
ܕܐܬܬܦ ܠܗ ܦܓܪܐ. ܢܬܟܠ ܡܢ ܫܡܗ ܣܓܝܐ ܕܠܦܓܬ
ܠܝ ܦܓܪܘܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܠܐ ܡܦܕܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܗܘܐ
ܙܒܢܗ ܕܕܘܫ ܘܕܐܒܪܗܡ ܒܒܗܪ. ܘܡܢܗ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܕܝܠܕܬܗ ܐܬܓܠܝ ܫܪܪܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ. ܡܢ ܦܓܪܘܬܐ
ܘܕܡܫܘܬܐ ܒܕܒܝܠ ܠܐ ܐܫܬܚܠܦ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܠܐ ܚܫܚܝܢ
ܠܫܦܪܝܪܘܬ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܢܦܫܗ. ‖ ܘܠܐܘܦܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܒܠܘܗ Fol. 22 v. *a*
ܪܚܡܗ. ܘܠܬܠܡܝܕܘܗܝ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܡܫܬܠܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܫܐ.
ܢܗܘܐ ܡܣܪܒܐ ܒܢܦܫܗ ܘܒܦܓܪܗ.. ܠܗܘܒܠ ܫܠܝܡ
ܫܒܝܠ ܒܠܘܗܝ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܟܝܢ ܘܡܢܟܝܢ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܢܦܫ.
ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܕܪܪܐ ܗܝ، ܕܡܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܒܪܬܗ
ܐܫܬܠܡܬ. ܬܒܬ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ. ܗܢܐ ܒܠܗ ܡܪܟܐ
ܡܢܝܢ ܒܐܦܘܬܐ ܢܠܝܐܬ. ܒܬܒܬܘܫܗ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ
ܡܟܝܢ. ܒܗ ܠܐ ܠܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܘܕܪܫܝܗܘܢ ܕܒܣܠܐ

ܐܫܬܟܚܘ. ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܡܢ ܠܗܝܡܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ. ܘܗܟܢ
ܗ̇ܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܪܫܝܢ ܘܡܠܘܗܝ، ܣܓܝ ܬܘܒܠܝܢ. ܕܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܓܝܪ
ܐܦ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܬܝܕ، ܗ̇ܢܘܢ. ܒܬܪ ܗ̇ܘ
ܕܢܒܥܘ.. ܘܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܡܫܬܐܠܐ ܒܠܐ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܣܒܝܪܐ
ܟܠܝ ܦܣܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ. ܣܝܡ ܒܡܕܝܢܬܗ ܫܪܪܐ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ
ܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ. ܘܡܛܠ ܕܐܟܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܫܝܚܐ
ܡܢܗܘܢ: ܢܦܫܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܠܗܘܢ ܢܦܩ ܫܘܬܦܐ. ܘܫܠܡܝܢ
ܢܐܕܘܢܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܦ ܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ: ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܢܦܫܝܢ
ܕܬܠܝܢ ܒܠܕܘܢܘܗܝ ܘܫܒܩ ܒܒܕܝܬܗܘܢ ܕܐܫܬܘܬܦܘܢ
Fol. 22 v. b. ܠܬܫܘܫܬܐ ܕܫܠܡ ܫܪܪܐ.‖ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܗ ܒܫܪܪܐ ܐܢܬܘܢ
ܘܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܒܠܥܘܬܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܡܢ ܘܡܢܗܘܢ
ܡܬܢܛܪܐ. ܫܠܡܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܬܥܒܕܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܘܡܐܪܟ ܐܝܕܐ
ܕܒܬܪܘܬܢ ܠܐ ܠܡܕܡ ܢܗܘܐ، ܐܠܐ ܠܗ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܕܐܘܚܕܝܢ
ܐܢܬܘܢ ܦܟܗ ܠܝ ܓܝܪ ܕܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܘܚܕܝܢ ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ
ܘܡܬܒܪܝܢ ܒܠܥܕܐ ܐܦ ܒܡܬܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ ܢܦܫܝܗܘܢ، ܕܠܐ
ܕܢܬܬܒ ܘܕܠܐ ܢܦܠܐ. ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܢܬܘܢ
ܘܐܦ ܠܒܢܝܢܘܬܗ، ܘܠܫܪܒܐ ܕܫܠܡܘܬܗ ܒܡܘܕܝܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ
ܐܫܬܒܘܢ ܘܐܦ ܡܟܝܠ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܘܙܕܝܩܐ ܐܝܬܝܢ:
ܘܪܫܐ ܕܐܦܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܡܕܝܢܬ ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܡܛܠ
ܠܢܟܘܬܗܘܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܕܢܛܪܘܢ ܘܐܝܟܢ، ܗܘ ܕܝܢ
ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܕܦܢܝܬܘܢ ܫܒܩ ܘܢܬܦܐ ܒܠ
ܒܟܠܕܒܟܘܢ، ܘܡܛܠܗ ܕܢܦܠ ܠܝ ܐܓܪܐ ܡܢܬܪܐ

[1] [ܣܠܩ] ܥܦܠ ܠܓܒܝܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܥܠ ܥܝܢܐ ܕܒܪܬܐ. ܘܒܥܘܪ
ܡܢܗܘܢ ܠܫܠܝܐ ܒܠܒܒܗܘܢ، ܕܐܠܝܟܐ. ܢܒܗܬܘܢ ܘܢܚܦܪܘܢ
ܡܕܡ ܫܘܢ ܕܢܬܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ. ܒܗ ܡܬܚܫܒܐ. ܐܦ ܐܢܬܝܢ
ܕܒܠܝܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܠܗ ܒܪ ܚܝܠܗ ܗܠܝܢ ‖ ܥܒܕܝ، ܒܪܚܡܘܗܝ. Fol. 23 r. *a.*
ܐܦ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܐܠܝܢܐ. ܒܒܝܬ ܗܘܘ ܒܪ ܦܬܠܐ ܠܒܢܝܢܗ
ܕܐܬܠܘܢܝ. ܒܗ ܒܐܘܪܫܠܡ ܡܫܬܒܚܝܢ ܕܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܐܝܟܢ
ܐܢܫ ܕܦܘܩ ܐܝܬ ܐܢ ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ. ܕܒܝܬܐ
ܠܡܘܬܐ ܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܥܠ ܐܦ ܡܘܬܐ. ܐܢܫܘ ܫܘܕܥܗ
ܕܬܠܡܝܕܐ. ܐܢܫܐ ܐܝܟܢ ܡܬܚܐ ܕܐܘܪܚܗ ܠܐܠܗܐ.
ܐܘܒܕܬܗ، ܠܓܒܝܐ ܘܫܠܝܬܗ، ܠܡܫܡܫܐ ܕܒܠܒܝ. ܠܐ
ܒܗ ܥܒܕܬܗ، ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܐܡܪ: ܕܡܢ ܕܡܘܕܐ ܒܝ ܐܘܕܐ
ܒܗ: ܘܡܢ ܕܟܦܪ ܒܝ ܐܟܦܘܪ ܒܗ. ܘܬܘܒ ܕܡܢ ܕܢܦܠܐ
ܕܢܦܫܗ ܢܘܒܕ ܢܘܒܕܝܗ. ܘܡܢ ܕܢܘܒܕ ܢܦܫܗ ܗܢܐ ܢܚܝܐ
ܠܗ. ܒܗ ܗܘ، ܒܪ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܢܦܠܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܠܗ
ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܢܟܦܘܪ ܒܢܦܫܗ ܘܢܫܩܘܠ ܙܩܝܦܗ. ܘܢܐܬܐ ܒܬܪܝ.
ܘܦܠܘܣ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܘܕܐ ܒܦܘܡܝ ܒܟܢܝ ܥܡ ܡܫܝܚܐ
ܘܗܘܝܬ ܠܒܢܝ. ܒܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ ܫܠܝܢ ܩܠܐ ܡܕܒܪܐ ܐܦ
ܡܠܦܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܘܡܕܘܪܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܫܠܝܚܐ. ܘܠܒܢܐ
ܕܠܗܘܢ ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܕܥܠ ܐܦ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ. ܘܗܘ،
ܕܫܒܝܚܐ ܘܢܛܪ ܡܢ ܠܗܘܢ ‖ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ. ܠܥܠܡܝܢ Fol. 23 r. *b.*

---

[1] Not in the ms.

ܘܒܪܗ ܕܚܝܐ ܐܠܗܐ. ܕܡܛܠ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܗ
ܘܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܒܢܝܢܫܐ. ܫܠܝܚ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ ܕܒܬܪܗ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ
ܡܣܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܘܫܐܠ. ܘܒܠܗܘܢ ܒܢܘܗܝ ܕܓܠܝܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ
ܐܢ ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܬ. ܒܟܠ ܙܒܢܝܢ ܕܕܗܒܐ ܐܝܟܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܗ
ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܦܪܝܗܘܢ ܐܦ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ. ܐܝܠܘ ܓܝܪ
ܕܗܦܟܐ ܒܝܫ ܡܢ ܪܥܝܢ ܦܠܚܐ ܕܡܕܒܪܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ. ܕܠܐ
ܒܐܘܠܨܢܐ ܘܒܪܕܘܦܝܐ ܘܒܨܪܐ ܘܒܢܣܝܘܬܐ ܘܒܚܫܘܫܐ
ܘܒܛܠܘܡܝܐ ܘܒܫܢܩܐ ܡܫܢܐ ܘܒܡܘܬܐ ܡܪܝܪܐ. ܗܟܢܐ
ܡܫܬܡܠܝܐ ܕܡܫܒܚܘܬܗ. ܘܐܬܒܗܬ ܒܡܫܡܠܝܘܬܗ ܠܗܘܢ
ܕܪܕܦܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ. ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܐ ܡܚܝܪ ܒܗܠܝܢ
ܕܐܡܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܢܝܐ ܡܫܡܗ ܕܒܪܪܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܬܗ. ܐܢ
ܡܕܒܪܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܘ ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ. ܘܐܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܝ
ܕܬܕܒܪ ܐܢܬ. ܘܠܐ ܬܬܒܥܠ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܫܠܡ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܟ
ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܗ ܡܬܬܚܢܢ. ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܠܟܘܕܪܝܘܣ
ܕܡܪܢܝ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܟܠܝܢ ܠܐ ܫܒܩ. ܠܐ ܬܪܦܐ ܐܬܪܐ
Fol. 23 v. a. ܕܐܣܝܘܬܐ ‖ ܕܡܫܟܝܢ ܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܠܡܪܕܐ ܕܫܠܦ ܡܪܕܐ.
ܥܒܕ ܠܒܪ ܕܗܝܕܐ ܕܩܫܝܫ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܟܠ ܗܘ ܐܝܢܐ
ܕܫܒܩ ܠܐܝܩܪܗ ܘܝܘܡܗ. ܕܢܒܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܫܠܡ ܢܬܬܕܪ
ܘܕܢܐ ܐܢܬ ܫܡܥ. ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܢܐ ܠܡܫܠ ܒܠܕܒܒܐ
ܫܠܡ ܡܫܝܚ ܕܐܬܒܪܝ: ܘܒܥܕ ܐܢܬ ܠܝ ܗܡܝܡܢܐ.
ܡܬܬܥܝܢܐ ܥܠ ܐܦܝ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܓܒܐ: ܘܗܫܐ ܐܢܬ
ܠܡܫܠ ܡܢ ܗܪܣܝܘܬܐ. ܠܗܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܘܒܫܠ ܐܝܢܐ

ܒܐܣܟܡܐ ܘܟܠܠܐ: ܕܒܪܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܬܗ ܠܒܪܝܬܐ ܠܐ
ܫܚܠܦ: ܘܒܪܐ ܐܢܐ ܠܐܪܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܒܒܣܪܝ[1]
ܒܝܠܕܐ. ܘܟܐܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܕܢܬܠ ܠܝ ܕܢܬܒܝܘܢ ܡܕܡ
ܕܢܦܫܝ. ܡܫܬܡܠܝܢ ܠܗ ܦܘܩܕܢܝ ܕܠܐ ܐܦܪܫܘܗܝ
ܠܦܠܓܘܬܗܘܢ: ܘܐܝܬ ܬܘܒ ܒܡܫܡܗܘܢ ܡܦܠܓܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ:
ܪܗܛ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܒܥܘܪ ܫܒܝܠܐ ܘܐܝܟ ܦܪܘܩܐ ܕܟܠܗܘ
ܗܦܝܘܢ ܒܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ: ܘܡܬܠܒܒ ܐܢܐ ܕܟܠܗ، ܢܦܠ
ܚܝܠܐ. ܗܝܘܢ ܫܪܘ ܒܫܘܒܚܐ ܘܐܬܠܘ ܚܘܕܬܐ ܘܕܠܚܘ
ܚܝܠܐ ܕܒܪܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ: ܘܠܐ ܫܒܩܬ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܘܒܚܐ.
ܫܒܘܩ ܐܢܐ ܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܬܒܥܬ ܐܝܟ Fol. 23 v. *b*.
ܕܐܬܝܗ̇: ܒܪ ܬܘܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܠܐ: ܘܒܫܘܒܚܐ
ܐܚܪܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܒܝܐ: ܘܟܬܒ ܠܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܘܬܐ ܢܟܪܝ
ܐܟܝ. ܫܒܝܪ ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܘܐܬܝܢ ܕܠܡܫܒܚܐ. ܡܟܦܪ
ܐܝܬ ܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܒܪܬܐ ܘܐܬܝܢ ܥܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܠܒܐ ܕܢܬܠܒܒ.
ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܒܡܫܘܚܬܗܘܢ: ܘܡܫܬܠܠ
ܠܒܘܝܐܐ ܐܒܘܬܗܘܢ. ܒܗܝܬ ܐܢܬ ܡܢ ܡܘܪܒܐ
ܐܒܘܬܗܘܢ ܗܐ ܒܫܝܢ ܘܡܬܠܒܝܢ ܘܠܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܦܬܪܢܐ.
ܫܒܝܩ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܒܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܒܬܪܗܘܢ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܒܨܝܢ ܡܢ
ܒܪܒܗܘܢ، ܢܠܝܢ ܠܗ ܬܘܒ ܬܠܬܝܬܝܐ ܕܐܣܟܡܐ ܐܢܬܘܢ. ܡܛܠ
ܕܒܝܘܬܐ ܕܢܠܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܐܬܝܬ ܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ

[1] Ms. adds ܡܢ.

ܕܫܠܝܘܬܗܘܢ܆ ܕܫܠܡܘܢ܆ ܢܗܝܪܝܢ ܒܡܠܟܘܬܗ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܘܗܘܘ ܡܪܥܝܬܐ
ܕܬܡܢ. ܘܡܫܡܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܟܘܢ ܒܐܠܗܐ ܡܪܐ ܟܠ.
[1] ܕܬܬܒܪܘܢ ܒܝܠܘܬܐ ܒܝܕܐ ܕܬܫܬܒܚܘܢ܆ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ
ܠܗ ܒܪ ܕܒܝܠܘܬܗܘܢ ܐܬܬܢܝܚܬ ܒܒܝܬܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ. ܗܘܘ
ܫܠܝܚܝܢ ܒܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܡܚܝܢܐ ܕܫܠܝܚܘܢ.

---

[1] So the ms.

C.

ܬܘܒ: ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܡܪܝ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ
ܕܠܘܬ ܙܝܢܘܢ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܛܠ
ܡܬܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ: ܘܡܬܟܪܙܢܘܬܗ
ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ. Fol. 17 r. *b.*

ܡܛܠ ܡܬܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ ܘܡܬܟܪܙܢܘܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ
ܡܠܬܐ ܐܘ ܪ̇ܚܡ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܙܝܢܘܢ ܡܠܟܐ: ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܒܪ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ: ܘܡܢܗ ܦܪܘܩ ܪ̈ܘܚܢܐ ܘܡܠ̈ܟܐ
ܐܬܝܠܕ: ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܟܠܙܒܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ:
ܘܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܡܛܠ ܕܠܝܬ ܡܢܗ ܕܠܐ ܫܢܐ:
ܘܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܒܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܒܝ. ܗܟܢܐ ܠܓܡܪ ܘܗܘܣܓܝܢ
ܘܡܟܠܢ. ܕܐܫܬܘܝ ܘܐܬ̣ܐ ܠܡܪܒܥܐ ܕܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܟܕ
ܠܐ ܥܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ. ܘܠܐ ܐܫܬܚܠܦ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܟܠܙܒܢ
ܥܡܗ ܘܠܘܬܗ ܘܐܒܘܗܝ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܠܐ ܒܟܠ ܕܗܘܐ
ܡܬܗܘܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ: ܗ̇ܘܝܘ ܕܡܢ ܒܕܡܘܬ
ܐܒܐ ܘܐܝܟ ܪ̇ܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ. ܓ̣ܒܐ ܕܢܫܐ ܠܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ
ܒܗ ܗܘܝܘ ܘܡܬܓܫܡܢܘܬܗ. ܘܚܫܗ ܘܡܘܬܗ.
ܘܩܝܡܬܗ. ܘܐܬܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܘܬ ܠܡܬܘܬܐ ܘܒܗ̇
ܘܡܢܗ ܐܬܓܠܝ. ܘܗܘܝܐ ܒܪܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ. ܟܕ

ܠܘ ܡܢ ܫܡܥܐ ܐܝܬܝ، ܠܗ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܘܠܝܢܘܣ ܘܒܪ
ܕܐܝܟ ܟܕ ܡܫܬܡܥܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘܬ
ܡܬܚܫܒܢܘܬܗ ܒܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܘ ܠܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ܝ ܟܒܢܐ
ܕܢܦܪܘܫ. ܐܠܐ ܠܗܕܐ. ܕܟܕ ܘܐܚܝܕܬ ܝܕܥܐ ܘܫܪܬ.
Fol. 17 v. *a.* ܐܦܠܐ ܒܡܘܠܦܢܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ‖ ܡܫܡܪܝܢ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܒܝܢܬܐ.
ܡܛܠ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܢܐ ܗܘ. ܘܫܡܐ ܗܢܐ
ܕܫܡܐ ܗܘ ܒܒܢܝܐ. ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܟܕ ܠܐ
ܝܕܥ. ܗܟܢܐ ܐܦ ܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ. ܒܝܫܘܒܬܐ
ܠܒܪ ܕܦܓܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܒܪܐ. ܘܠܘ ܒܒܪܐ ܣܓܝ: ܘܠܗܢܐ
ܐܡܪܢ ܠܡܠܦܢܘ. ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܢܦܠ ܟܠ
ܬܠܬܝܘܬܐ. ܘܫܬܩܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܒܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܠܒܪܝܬܐ.
ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܠܗ ܗܒܠ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܘ
ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܟܕ ܦܓܪܢܐ ܡܬܗܡܢܐ.
ܕܐܬܒܪܝ ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܘܐܬܝܠܕ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܬܐ. ܒܠ
ܕܒܗ ܘܡܢܗ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܬܒܪܝ.. ܗܘ ܕܝܠܕܬ. ܒܗܝ، ܕܠܘ
ܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܠܐܕܡ. ܕܗܢܐ ܡܘܠܕܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ.
ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܐܘܠܕܗ ܐܒܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ
ܐܦ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܕܐܒܐ ܐܘܠܕܗ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܟ ܦܓܪܢܐ
ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܘܡܘܠܕܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ. ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܦܓܪܢܐܝܬ
ܕܟܕ ܗܢܐ ܡܘܠܕܐ ܦܓܪܢܝܐ ܢܬܝܠܕ ܚܢ ܠܗܘ ܪܘܚܢܐ.
ܗܘܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘܐ. ܘܡܢܬ
ܡܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܗܘܝܢ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܟܕ

ܦܬܚ. ܗ̇ܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܒܟܝܢܐ. ܗܝܡܢ ܓܝܪ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩ̈ܕܝܫܐ
ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܘܐܦ ܗܫܐ ܠܐ || ܐܫܬܘܕܥ ܚܝܢ. ܘܗܘܝܐ Fol. 17 v. *b*
ܗܘ [1] ܒܟܝܢܐ ܒܫܠܒܘܬܐ. ܕܝܢ ܦܠܓ ܠܐ ܐܫܬܢܝܬ
ܐܝܬܘܬܗ. ܚܕ ܗܟܝܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܡܘ̇ܕܐ ܐܢܐ.
ܕܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܦ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܗܐ
ܕܗܘܝܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܟܕ ܠܘ ܒܒܪܢܫܐ ܥܒܪ. ܘܠܘ ܗܘܠܐ ܒܪܐ
ܠܗ ܘܡܒܪܐ ܒܗ. ܗܘܬܒܠܘܗܝ ܓܝܪ ܚܕ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܘܗܘ ܒܥܒܪ
ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܐܢܫܐ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܒܪܐ ܠܗ ܒܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܡܕܡ ܕܢܒܪܐ ܒܗ. ܘܠܗܘܢܐ ܢܣܒ ܐܝܟ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ.
ܒܗ ܕܠܘ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܐܠܐ ܠܚܝܢ ܒܪ
ܡܬܓܫܡܢܘܬܗ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܠܐ ܢܓܕ ܐܢܐ ܒܒܬܘܠܬܐ
ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܢܦܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܘܠܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܕܒܝܩ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ.
ܐܠܐ ܚܕܐ ܐܢܐ ܒܪ ܚܢܢܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ. ܪܘܚܢܐ ܕܕܠܐ
ܓܘܫܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܦܓܪܐ. ܘܠܝܬ ܡܚܝܕ. ܠܘ ܒܦܘܫܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ. ܐܠܐ ܠܚܘܝܐ ܕܦܓܪܐ ܕܡܫܝܚ.
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܠܘ ܦܠܓܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܦܠܓܗ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܐܠܐ
ܟܠܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ. ܘܟܠܗ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܟܠ
ܕܗܘܝܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܘܕܗܘܬ ܚܫܘܬܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܝ ܡܘܕܢܐ.
ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܠܐܢܫܘܬܐ. ܟܕ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܦܠܓܢܐ
ܠܚܝ̈ܐ ܐܘ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ. ܐܘ ܠܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ.

---

[1] Ms. adds ܗܘܐ.

Fol. 18 r. *a*. ܠܦܠܛܝܢ ‖ ܕܐܬܦܢܝܘ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ. ܘܠܐ ܫܢܐ ܐܢܐ
ܬܐܡܝܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܗܘܘ ܚܕ. ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܚܕ ܐܝܟܐ
ܕܡܬܚܕܝܢ ܬܐܡܝܢ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܗܘܐ. ܘܐܬܚܝܕ
ܠܡܫܝܚܐ. ܘܡܢ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܢܐܡܪ
ܠܐ ܡܗܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܦܓܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܝܢ
ܢܗܡܢ ܕܕܠܗ ܗܘ ܦܓܪܐ ܟܠ ܕܐܬܒܪܝ. ܕܢܘܡܘܣܐ ܗܘ
ܡܕܡ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܦܓܪܢܘܬܐ. ܘܠܐ[1] ܕܢܘܡܘܣܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܕܒܪܢܫܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܦܓܪܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܚܕ ܡܢ
[1]ܐܠܗܐ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܗܘܝܢ ܒܢܝ̈ܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܐܚ̈ܐ
ܠܡܫܝܚܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܐܦ ܠܐ [2]ܕܗܘ ܒܢܝܐ ܐܝܟ
ܢܘܡܘܣܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܡܬܝܠܕ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ. ܢܦܬܪ
[3]ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘܐ ܦܓܪܐ ܘܐܬܚܝܒ ܕܐܢܫܝܐ.
ܘܡܢ ܢܦܫܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܡܠܬܗ ܕܠܗ. ܟܡܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢܝܢܐ
ܐܢܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܒܦܓܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢܟ ܟܝ. ܠܘ ܒܫܘܚܠܦܐ
ܗܘ. ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܚܫܐ ܗܘ. ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܒܪܢܘܬܐ. ܕܗܘܐ
ܓܝܪ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܘܦܠܓܘܬ. ܕܐܫܬܘܚܠܦ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܐ
ܚܕ ܡܢ ܐܠܝܢ ܕܗܘܘ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܘܡܬܩܪ̈ܒܢܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ. ܡܛܠ
ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܟܕ ܢܒܥ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܡܪܝܐ
ܘܠܐ ܐܫܬܚܠܦܬ. ܐܡܪܐ ܕܐܬܚܒܪ ܕܐܫܬܚܠܦ ܡܛܠ
ܕܐܬܓܒܠ. ܬܘܒ ܡܬܐܡܪܬ ܐܦܣܘܣ ܟܠ ܥܕܪܐ ܕܠܐ

[1] So the ms. Supply ܕ? [2] So the ms. Supply ܦܓܪܐ? [3] So the ms. Supply ܕܐܠܗܐ?

ܡܫܬܚܠܦܘܬܗ܆ ܘܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܕܐܬܡܠܟ
ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܡܚܝܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ [1] ܕܐܡܒܪ
ܐܫܬܚܠܦ. ܒܪ ܫܢܝܐ. ‖ ܕܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܡܚܪܢܐ ܘܠܐ Fol. 18 r. *b*.
ܐܫܬܚܠܦܬ. ܕܚܕ ܗܘ ܒܪܐ ܗܒܠ ܐܬܝܗܘܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܘܢ
ܡܩܠܕܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܕܚܕ
ܒܪܐ ܘܠܘ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ. ܘܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܝܗܘܢ, ܚܕ.
ܐܦ ܕܝܢ ܢܬܪܐ ܚܕܐ ܘܚܕܝ. ܐܠܗܐܝܬ ܐܦ ܡܘܡܬܐ
ܘܡܘܡܬܐ ܡܬܝܕܒ. ܘܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܣܬܒܪ. ܐܦ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ
ܟ̈ܝܢܐ ܘܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܩ̈ܠܡܐ. ܐܬܚܙܝܬ ܗܒܠ ܡܘܡܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ
ܒܚܕܢܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܘܠܐ ܐܬܪܫܝܡܬ
ܡܬܓܫܡܢܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܬܗܡܟ ܒܪ ܚܕܝܢ ܒܗ, ܕܒܪܐ
ܠܗ ܗܘܐ. ܘܒܪܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܒܐ [2] ܡܩܠܕܐ
ܦܓܪܐ. ܟܠ ܕܟܠܡ ܐܒܐ ܗܘ. ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܪܘܚܐ
ܕܩܘܕܫܐ. ܟܠ ܕܠܘ ܒܪܐ ܢܦܩ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ.. ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܪܐ
ܠܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܗܘ. ܕܠܝܬ ܗܘܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ.
ܘܡܬܗܢܝܢ ܗܘ ܒܪ ܗܘ ܒܪܐ ܠܘܬ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܘܢ ܡܩܠܕܐ.
ܘܗܘܐ ܥܠܝܐܝܬ ܒܪܐ ܠܒܬܘܠܬܐ. ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܥܘܒܐ
ܘܡܫܒܚܢܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ. ܠܗ ܓܝܪ ܒܪ ܠܗ
ܗܘ̈ܝ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܐܬܝܠܕ. ܘܟܠ ܕܒܪܐ ܐܬܝܗܘܢ,
ܗܘܝܐ. ܐܦ ܒܪܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܒܪ ܗܘܝܐ ܕܠܐ

---

[1] So the ms. Supply ܘܡܕܒܪ? [2] So the ms. Read ܡܣܡܟܐ?

ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܒܪܝܫܐ. ܘܐܦ̈ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܒܝܚܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܬ̈ܘܠܬܐ:
ܕܫܪ ܗܘ ܐܬܬܚܝܨ: ܘܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܦ ܐܬܬܒܝܕ ܘܐܬܬܘܣܝ,
Fol. 18 v. a. ܣܓܝܐܐ. ܡܢ ܐܒܐ: ܘܡܥܒܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܘܬܐ: ܠܗ ܦܢܝܐ ‖
ܕܢܣܝܡ ܕܡܬܬܣܒ. ܘܐܦ ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܬܬܥܬܐ ܘܡܝܬܪܬܐ
ܕܠܫܡܝܢ ܠܐܫܠܡܘܬܐ. ܡܬܩܕܝܡ ܓܝܪ ܠܒܬܘܠܘܬܐ ܕܐܬܬܗ
ܢܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܗ ܬܘܒ ܠܓܠܬܐ ܕܐܬܬܟܒܫ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ
ܕܐܬܬܒܝܕ ܡܢܗ ܦܓܪܐܝܬ. ܡܫܬܡܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܬܩܦܪܢ
ܒܝܘܪܐ ܚܝܡ ܣܠܩܐ. ܡܛܠ ܓܘܪܬܐ. ܐܬܬܟܝܢ ܒܠ
ܦܘܪܩܐ. ܐܬܬܪܒ ܒܫܘܡܠܝܬܐ. ܐܫܬܡܥܬ ܠܐܟܣܢܝܐ
ܗܠܝܢ ܒܝܫܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܬܒܝܕ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܠܐ ܣܓܝܢ ܗܘܝܐ
ܕܬܬܦܪܫܐ ܘܬܬܦܫܐ ܒܗ, ܕܡܬܬܚܒ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܠܐ
ܫܒܪ *ܒܠܚܘܕ [1]ܡܛܠ ܕܐܬܟܪܙ. ܟܕ ܠܒ ܡܫܬܠܡܢܐ
ܗܘ. ܘܓܡܪܐ ܒܚܝܐ ܘܒܫܘܡܠܝܗ. ܒܗܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܗܘܐ
ܒܗ, ܐܬܬܟܪ. ܕܢܠܗ ܙܘܕܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܚܝܘ. ܘܕܢܠܗ
ܠܒܢܘܬܐ ܒܠ ܕܐܬܦܝܣ. ܕܢܠܗ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܟܪ
ܐܬܬܘܗ ܗܘ. ܘܕܢܠܗ ܕܢܠܗ ܒܠ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܒܘܬܗ ܕܢܠܗ.
ܫܒܝܚܘܬܐ ܒܠ ܕܡܒܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ. ܘܕܢܠܗ ܒܝܬܪܬܐ
ܒܠ ܕܐܬܬܓܠܝ ܒܦܘܪ. ܕܢܠܗ ܗܘ ܕܒܝܢ. ܘܕܢܠܗ ܗܘ
ܕܐܘܪܚ ܠܣܒܪܐ. ܗܢܝ ܘܐܘܪܒ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܒܘܬܗ ܗܟܒ
ܠܒܢܝܢܐ ܘܐܘܪܒ ܕܗܘܝ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܒܝܫܐ.

[1] In the ms. ܡܛܠ ܒܠܚܘܕ (with 3 dots to indicate that the words must be transposed).

ܐܬܬܥܝܩܬ ܒܗ̇ ܗܘܝܐ. ܘܠܐ ܚܠܝܐ ܕܫܘܠܛܢܗ ܐܬܚܪ̈ܝ:
ܠܥܒܕ̈ ܡܢ ܢܘܚܡ ܒܘܢܕܝܢ. ܘܐܫܬܘܕܝ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܕܒܪܗ
ܗܘ ܚܒܝܒܐ. ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܬܒܕܢܐ ܥܠ ܢܘܕܝܢ.
ܐܒܐ ܕܦܪܩ̈ܢ. ܒܪܐ ܕܦܪܩ. ܪܘܚܐ ܕܦܪܩܘܝܐ. ܠܥܒܕ̈. Fol. 18 v. *b*.
ܒܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܠܗ ܒܥܒܘܕܘܬܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܠܗܘܬ ܪܘܚܐ
ܕܥܒܘܕܘܬܐ ܕܢܘܟܪܝܐ. ܘܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܫܬܘܕܝܘܬܐ. ܠܘܬ
ܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ ܫܪܪܐ ܕܦܪܘܩܘܬܐ. ܠܗܘ ܕܫܪܝܬ ܒܥܒܕܘܬܐ
ܠܗ ܐܬܬܥܝܪܬ ܥܠܘ ܡܥܒܕܐ. ܘܠܗܘ ܕܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܥܠܘ
ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܒܗ ܡܬܬܒܥܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܡܬܝܢ ܥܠ ܢܦܫܐ. ܚܕ
ܡܢ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܥܠܘ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܚܕ ܡܢ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܒܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ. ܚܕ ܡܢ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܥܠ ܢܦܫܐ. ܒܚܕ
ܒܪܐ ܡܫܡܫܢܝܢ. ܘܒܚܕ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܚܕ ܪܘܚܐ. ܠܗ ܓܝܪ
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܘ ܒܪܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܡܬܝܕܥ ܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ.
ܗܢܐ ܕܢܣܒ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܚܠܦܝܢ ܘܐܬܝܗܒ ܒܗ ܓܢܫܐ.
ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܫܬܘܕܝ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܐܒܐ ܒܗ̇ ܥܒܕ̈: ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܪ̈
ܢܫܐ. ܗܘܝܘ ܕܥܒܕܐ ܒܐܘܫܥܢܐ. ܕܐܒܐ ܒܐܪ̈ܙܝܢ.
ܦܫܝܩ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ ܠܪܘܚ. ܘܥܠ *ܐܒܘܗܝ. ܡܪܐ [1] ܠܐܠܗܝ.
ܕܡܬܚܐ ܕܒܪܗ ܗܘ.. ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܥܠ ܢܦܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ
ܐܬܡܟܟ: ܗܘܝܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܢܐ. ܐܚܝܕ ܗܘܐ
ܒܪܒܘܬܗ. ܒܗ̇، ܕܠܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ، ܒܗ ܡܘܬܐ ܡܦܩܢܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ.

---

[1] The ms. ܡܪܐ ܐܚܘܗܝ cf. p. 167 n.

ܕܚܝܘܗܝ. ܐܦ ܠܒܪ ܟܝܢܢ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ [1]ܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܬܚܡܝܢ:
ܐܠܘܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܐܝܟ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܟܠܗ ܥܠܡܐ.. ܚܢܢ
Fol. 19 r. *a.* ܕܝܢ ‖ ܚܢܢ ܠܬܘܕܝܬܐ. ܕܠܐ ܒܗ̇ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܠܡܬܪܢܐ
ܕܐܬܥܝܠܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ. ܘܠܐ ܒܡܘܬܐ ܢܦܩ ܕܐܘܦܝܐ
ܚܝܐ ܕܒܝܬܐ. ܘܢܦܩܐ ܒܙܘܓܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܘܬܗ. ܘܕܠܐ
ܡܬܬܚܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܗ. ܒܗ̇ ܕܒܙܒܢܐ ܠܘܬܗ ܡܢ ܥܢܝܕܐ
ܡܬܚܝܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܐ. ܒܙܘܥܐ
ܕܡ ܟܕ ܢܦܫܐ ܐܬܝܕܥ ܡܬܪܬܝܗܝܢ. ܒܗ̇ ܕܟܕ ܦܠܓܝܢ
ܡܘܬܐ ܚܢܢ ܗܘ. ܘܠܘ ܡܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܫܒܩ ܚܝܘܗܝ.
ܐܠܐ ܥܒܕܘܗܝ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܐܬܒܛܠ، ܟܕ ܡܝܬ ܗܘ.
ܕܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ ܗ̣ܘ. ܠܒܪ ܡܘܬܗ ܟܬܒ ܗܘܘ: ܠܘ ܠܒܪ
ܡܝܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܘܗܝ، ܗܘ ܕܡܟܪܙ ܡܘܬܐ
ܠܗܘܢ. ܕܠܐ ܡܫܬܪܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܥܘܠܒܢܗ ܕܡܘܬܐ
ܒܚܝܘܬܐ. ܕܗܕܐ ܕܢܡܘܬ ܡܝܘܬܐ. ܟܕ ܚܠܦ ܐܬܡܢܒܬ.
ܕܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܡ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܡܢܗ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ. ܗܕܐ
ܣܝܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܚܕܐ ܘܕܡ ܒܥܘܡܩܐ. ܠܐ ܠܒܪ ܟܠܝܐ ܠܡ
ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܚܝܐ ܒܡܘܬܗ. ܘܠܐ ܐܠܘܐ
ܠܡ ܡܘܬܗ ܕܒܫܘܪ ܟܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܗ. ܐܬܠܒܟ ܐܠܗܐ
ܡܢ ܡܘܬܐ. ܘܟܕ ܗ̇ܕܐ ܦܠܓܗ ܡܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܕܒܢܝܢܐ.
ܟܠ ܕܠܗ ܠܒܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܠܗ ܐܘܣܝܐܝܬ ܡܢܗ.

[1] The ms. ܡܘܡܐ (sic).

ܘܡܢ ܗ̇ܕܐ ܐܦ ܡܠܠ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܬܐ ܐܢܬܬܗ ܒܢܝܗ.
ܥܠ ܕܦܓܪܐ ܡܫܬܒܚܐ ܠܥܠܡܝܢ ܕܒܫܘܬܐ ܦܓܪܐܝܬ
ܐܬܚܫܒ ܒܗ. ܠܘ ‖ ܓܝܪ ܦܓܪܐ ܕܢܦܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܐܘ Fol. 19 r. *b.*
ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܡܫܠܡܐ ܐܢܫܬܝ, ܘܡܠܬܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܒܗ
ܐܘܚܕܢܗ. ܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܒܚܝܢ ܦܬ̈ܓܡܘ. ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܢܫܬܝ,
ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܐܘܚܕ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܘܚܕܢܗ
ܬܘܒ ܐܒܐ. ܐܝܟ ܡܠܬ ܦܘܠܘܣ. ܐܠܗܐ ܠܟ ܐܒܘܗܝ,
ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܘܚܕܢܗ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡ̈ܝܬܐ. ܐܘܚܕܢܗ ܐܦ ܙܘܥܐ
ܕܗܘܕܝܐ. ܐܬܬܥܝܕ ܠܟ ܒܪܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܘܒܪܘܚܐ
ܕܩܘܕܫܐ. ܡܢ ܩܝܡܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡ̈ܝܬܐ. ܐܘܚܕ ܐܦ
ܗܘ ܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ. ܕܫܠܝܛ ܐܢܫܐ ܥܠ ܢܦܫ
ܕܐܘܚܕܢܗ̇. ܘܫܠܝܛ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܬܘܒ ܢܣܒܝܗ̇. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܫܒܩܬ ܡܢ ܦܓܪܐ ܟܕ ܡܝܬܐ ܒܙܩܝܦܐ. ܕܐܒܐ
ܒܐܝ̈ܕܝܟ ܣܐܡ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܪܘܚܝ. ܘܠܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܡܪ
ܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ. ܕܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܗܝ ܠܡܢܐ ܫܒܩܬܢܝ. ܘܐܦܢܝܗ,
ܐܒܘܗܝ, ܕܒܪ ܚܝܘܗܝ ܗ̣ܘ. ܘܐܠܗܗ ܥܠ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܗ̇ܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܬܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܙܩܝܦܐ. ܟܕ ܫܡ ܪܘܚܗ ܒܐܝ̈ܕܝ,
ܐܒܘܗܝ: ܠܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܩܝܡܬܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܒܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ
ܐܒܐ ܢܣܒ. ܘܗ̣ܘ ܟܕ ܗ̣ܘ ܒܦܓܪܗ ܢܚܬ ܠܫܝܘܠ.
ܘܩܢܝܬܐ ܠܦܓܪ̈ܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܚܛܐ. ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܚܝܘܗ
ܕܡܠܬܐ ܡܢܟܝܢ ܗܘܝܬ ܣܢܝܐ. ܘܠܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܠܒܪ
ܡܢܗ ܡܫܒܚܝܢ ܕܡܢܗ. ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܠܥܠ ܡܢ

ܡܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܠܝܛ ܒܗ ܐܝܟ
Fol. 19 v a. ܒܢܝܢܐ. ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܬܕܪܟܐ ܒܪܐ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܡܠܬܗ ܕܠܘܬ ܬܠܡܝܕܘܗܝ. ܕܫܘܘ
ܬܠܡܕܘ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܥܡ̈ܡܐ ܘܐܥܡܕܘ[1] ܐܢܘܢ ܒܫܡ ܐܒܐ
ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ[2] ܒܫܡܗ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܗܘ ܕܡܥܒܕܬ
ܚܕܝܘܬ. ܘܗܘ ܕܒܫܡܗ ܚܕܝܘܬ ܠܗ ܡܘܕܝܢܐ ܕܡܥܒܕܬ ܣܠܩ.
ܘܠܗܘ ܕܚܕܝܘܬ ܒܫܡܗ ܘܒܡܘܬܗ. ܠܗ ܡܗܝܡܢ ܐܢܐ
ܕܠܚܝܬ ܡܢ ܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܦܘܠܘܣ ܠܪܗܘܡܝܐ
ܟܢ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܦܓܪܢܝܐ. ܠܚܝܘܬ ܪܘܚܢܝܬ ܡܢ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ.
ܘܠܗܢܐ ܕܒܡܫܝܚ ܐܬܥܡܕܢ ܒܡܘܬܗ. ܠܗ ܡܘܕܝܢܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
ܡܫܝܚܢܐ ܘܡܦܪܩܢܐ ܕܚܝܐ. ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܢ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܡܕܡ ܡܫܚܠܦ ܐܢܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܠܡܘܗ ܘܦܫܝܩܘܗ ܟܕ
ܡܬܠܝܢ ܡܥܡܕܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܘܗܝ ܡܦܠܓ ܐܢܐ. ܐܝܟ
ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܪܝܘܣ ܘܡܩܕܘܢܝܘܣ. ܘܠܐ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܫܡܫ ܐܢܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܪܢܘ ܬܐܘܕܘܪܘܣ
ܘܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ. ܘܠܐ ܕܐܬܦܠܓ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܘܗܝ ܐܡܪ
ܐܢܐ. ܐܝܟ ܐܦܘܠܝܢܪܝܘܣ ܘܐܘܛܘܟܐ.. ܡܫܢܝܢ ܐܢܐ
ܩܒܠ ܠܬܪܝܢܐ ܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ. ܘܠܬܠܡܝܕܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܕܦܠܓ
ܚܢ̈ܢܐ ܘܡܩܒܠܢܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܬܕܡܪ̈ܬܐ
ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܢܫܐ ܠܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܦܪܫ ܠܟܠܐܝܬ ܒܡܪܟܒܘܬܐ

---

[1] So the ms. [2] The ms. ܕܩܘܫܐ.

ܕܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܬܒܢܝ. ܚܣܝܢ ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܝ.
ܐܦ ܠܐܘܦܝܐ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ. ܘܠܬܪܒܝܬܗ ܗܘ ܕܐܠܨ
ܠܬܫܡܫܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܕܗܘܬ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܘܬܐ.
ܘܫܒܩ ‖ ܪܘܪܒܢܘܬܐ ܠܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܦܪܢܣܘܬܗ. ܘܟܕ ܫܠܡ Fol. 19 v. *b.*
ܡܫܠܡܢܐ ܡܚܣܢ ܐܢܐ. ܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܡܢܝܚܐ ܡܬܕܟܪ ܐܢܐ.
ܘܒܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܗܬܐ ܪܕܐ ܐܢܐ. ܕܡܫܝܚܘܢ
ܘܡܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܘܡܠܝܘܬܐ ܘܡܫܠܡ. ܐܝܟ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܚܕܬܗ ܒܗ ܒܠܒܗ ܒܫܝܢܐ. ܠܫܝܢܐ
ܘܠܐܝܪܘܬܐ ܘܠܡܫܡܫܘ ܒܢܝܐ. ܫܠܡ ܒܟܘܪܘܬܐ ܒܬܒܬ
ܘܫܒܩ ܠܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܐ ܡܠܝܠ ܕܩܒܪܘܢ ܐܦ ܕܝܠ
ܠܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܟܐ. ܠܡܫܡܫܘܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ ܕܡܫܠܡܢܘ
ܠܡܫܡܫܘ ܕܒܡܫܝܚܐ. ܘܠܟܢܫܐ ܕܐܢܫܝܢ ܕܡܬܪܚܡܝܢ
ܐܒܘܗܝ. ܘܡܫܝܚ ܒܗ ܫܒܩܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܫܒܘܩ
ܪܘܚܐ ܫܠܡ.. + ..

APPENDIX I

AN ANONYMOUS NOTICE ON PHILOXENUS

Ms. (Vat. Syr. 155, fol. 5 *r*, *a-b*).

ܡܪܝ ܦܝܠܟܣܝܢܘܣ ܐܦܝܣܩ̄ ܕܡܒܘܓ ܣܚܝܩ ܒܐܠܗܐ
ܘܩܕܝܫ ܒܝܬ ܚܘܬܐ. ܗܘ̣ ܐܬܐ̄ ܡܪܝ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܕܡܬܩܒܠ
ܒܚܬܟܐ. ܘܐܬܐ̄ ܡܢ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܬܚܠ[1] ܕܐܬܬܢܝ ܒܐܬܪܐ
ܕܦܪܣܝܐ ܘܟܕ ܐܬܬܪ ܒܚܠܦ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܪܝܝܐ. ܘܢܦܠ
ܘܠܦܢܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܕܪ. ܗܘܐ ܐܦܝܣܩ̄ ܒܡܒܘܓ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ
ܒܫܢܬ ܬܡܢܡܐܐ ܒܝܘܡ ܕܐܝܠܘܢ ܡܠܟܐ. ܕܐܬܬܢܝ
ܫܢܬ ܐܪܒܥܡܐܐ ܘܬܡܢܝܢ ܘܬܡܢܝܐ ܒܬܪ ܡܐܬܝܬܗ
ܕܡܪܢ. ܘܗܘ̣ ܐܬܐ̄ ܗܘܐ ܪܫ ܗܘܢܐ ܒܡܬܬܪܓܡܢܘܬܗ
ܕܡܪܝ ܫܡܥܘܢ ܦܐܠܐ̈. ܘܟܕ ܡܠܟ ܠܓܘܬܐ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ
ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܘܦܫܩ ܠܟܬܒܐ: ܘܦܪܣ ܠܗܘܢ̄ ܕܢܣܒܪܘܢ
ܟܕ ܬܬܒܗ ܕܠܘܬܗܘܢ. ܢܕܐܘܣ ܒܐܟܣܢܝܐ
ܒܡܪ̈ܬܐ[1] ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܘܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܒܬܘܕܝܐ. ܣܓܝܐܘܗܝ ܕܝܢ
ܒܡܠܬܐ ܣܓܝܐ ܘܡܟܝܢ[1] ܬܘܕܝܐ[1] ܕܝܠܗ ܒܝܬܐ ܠܬܝܒܘܬܐ
ܘܐܝܟܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܘܗܡܝܢܐ ܐܬܦܠܠ. ܘܐܬܢܝܚ ܡܢܗܘܢ
ܒܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܓܢܓܪܐ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܦܝܠܟܣܝܢܘܣ ܪܫܝܡ
ܐܒܩܝܢܐ ܡܬܦܩܕ.

[1] So the ms.

At the bottom of the page, in the margin, we read the following note:

ܦܝܠܘܟܣܝܢܘܣ ܐܝܬܘ̄ ܡܪܝ، ܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܕܡܒܘܓ
ܕܒܬܪܢܐ ܢܒܥܘܗܝ. ܕܠܐ ܥܠܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܥܒܕܘܗ
ܕܒܠܡܕܘܢܝܐ: ܠܗ̄ ܣܢܐ ܢܩܫ ܠܟܪܙܬ ܘܟܪܘܙܐ.

APPENDIX II

THEOLOGICAL GLOSSARY.

ܐܝܟ. Occurs often unaccompanied by the usual ܕ, not only in the sense of *as* (sicut), but also in the sense of *in so far as* (in quantum). ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ, in so far as He is God (in quantum est Deus); ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ, in so far as He is man (in quantum est homo).

ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. He is. Used generally in speaking of the existence of God, and, as such, opposed to ܗܘܐ (to become).

ܐܝܬܘܬܐ. Essence; existence; substance. In the meaning of essence, opposed to the noun ܗܘܝܐ (becoming); v. g. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܒܐܝܬܘܬܗ ܗܟܢܐ ܦܫ ܐܦ ܒܗܘܝܗ. As He is in His essence, so He remained also in His becoming.

ܐܝܬܝܐ. Existing, being, Supreme Being, substance. With ܕ, substantial. The Word is called ܨܠܡܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܐ, the substantial Image of the Father.

ܐܠܗܐ. God. ܐܒܐ, ܒܪܐ, ܡܠܬܐ, ܪܘܚܐ, used in opposition with it.

ܐܢܫܐ. Man. Said of Christ, less often however than the word ܒܪܢܫܐ.

ܐܢܫܘܬܐ. Humanity. According to the Monophysites, the humanity is not considered as a nature in Christ after the union, but it forms with the divinity one nature.

ܐܢܬܬܐ. Woman. Means sometimes the Blessed Virgin.

ܐܬܠܝܛܐ. Warrior, athlete. A title given by Philoxenus to Christ as Redeemer.

ܒܣܪ. Flesh. ܒܣܪ ܗܘܐ, He was made flesh. Outside of St. John 1.14, this expression is used but seldom to denote the Incarnation.

ܒܥܠܕܒܒܐ : Adversary; enemy. Used also by Philoxenus in the meaning of « the Devil ».

ܒܨܪ. To diminish, to be less. Said of those who, by denying the divinity of the Son of God, reduced the Trinity to two divine persons.

ܒܪܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ. Natural Son (Filius Naturalis).

ܒܪܐ ܕܛܝܒܘܬܐ. Son of grace (Filius Adoptivus).

ܒܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ.) Son of the essence, having the same es-
ܒܪ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ.) sence, Consubstantial.

ܒܪ ܟܝܢܐ. The usual Syriac expression for Consubstantial.

ܒܪ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ. Having the same measure, equal.

ܠܒܪ ܡܢ. Outside of; distinct from. In Christ, the Nestorians admitted a man outside of and distinct from the Word, ܒܪܢܫܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ.

ܒܪܢܫܐ. Man. This is the word generally used with ܗܘܐ in speaking of the Incarnation.

ܐܬܒܪܢܫ. To be humanified (made man). It is the equivalent of the word ἐνανθρωπῆσαι in the Greek Fathers.

ܡܬܒܪܢܫܢܘܬܐ. Humanifying. It is the equivalent of the word ἐνανθρώπησις in the Greek Fathers, and is generally, though loosely, translated by Incarnation.

ܓܠܝܢܐ. Manifestation, revelation, transfiguration. Means also the manifestation of God in the flesh, the Incarnation (ἐπιφάνεια).

ܦܓܪ. Body. Often used in a metaphorical sense, v. g. ܦܓܪܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ, the body of truth. In speaking of the body of Christ the word ܒܣܪ is generally used.

ܐܬܦܓܪ. To put on a body, to be embodied; denominative from ܦܓܪ. ܐܬܦܓܪ ܒܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܘܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ, He was embodied in the Virgin and of the Virgin.

ܡܬܦܓܪܢܘܬܐ. Embodiment. It translates the σάϱκωσις and ἐνσωμάτωσις of the Greek Fathers.

ܕܒܩ. To adhere; in the Aphel, to join, to cause to adhere. The Nestorians held that the Word of God caused a man to adhere to His person, and thus they admitted only a moral union between the two natures in Christ.

ܕܡܘܬܐ. Likeness. ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܘܝܐ, the likeness of God as Creator.

ܗܘܐ. To be, to become. When used alone in speaking of the Word of God, it has the meaning « to become (man) », v. g. ܗܘܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܫܬܚܠܦ, He became (man) and He was not changed. ܗܘܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ, He became man; ܗܘܐ ܒܣܪ, He became flesh; ܗܘܐ ܦܓܪܐ, He became a body.

ܗܘܝ. Birth, generation, existence, becoming. Applied to the second Person of the Trinity, it generally means « becoming (man) », and is thus opposed to ܐܝܬܘܬܐ, essence.

ܚܕܝܘܬܐ. Unity, union. The Monophysites professed not only the union, but also the unity of the natures in Christ for they admitted only one nature ofter the Incarnation.

ܚܕܬܘܬܐ. Novelty. Used also in the sense of new doctrine, heresy. Philoxenus seems to apply it to the definition of the Council of Chalcedon regarding the existence of the two natures in Christ.

ܚܘܠܦܐ. Change; mixture.

ܫܘܚܠܦܐ . Change.

Though the Jacobites admitted only one nature after the union, they denied that the divinity suffered any change.

ܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܘܬܐ . Immutability.

ܚܫܐ . Suffering; passion; Passion of Christ; alteration, modification v. g. ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܚܫܐ ܗܘ , change is a modification.

ܬܘܕܝܬܐ . Creed in general, v. g. ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ , the right creed, orthodoxy, which for the Jacobites is Monophysitism; external confession of faith; particular doctrine or dogma, v. g. ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ , the dogma of the Trinity.

ܝܠܝܕ . Begotten. Generally used in speaking of the eternal generation of the Word, and as such, contrasted with ܐܬܝܠܕ (he was born).

ܝܠܕܬ ܐܠܗܐ . Mother of God, *θεοτόκος*.

ܬܘܣܦܬܐ . Addition, increase. In a special sense used by the Monophysites to designate the definition of the Council of Chalcedon, which definition they considered as an addition to the faith of the Council of Nicea.

ܠܘܬ . Near (apud). ܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ , Apud Deum.

ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ . From nothing, ex nihilo.

ܡ̈ܝܐ . Water. Used once by Philoxenus in the sense of Baptism.

ܡܟ̈ܝܟܬܐ . Low, humble things. This word denotes the properties of the human nature in Christ.

ܡܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ . From two. Translates the Monophysite expression that Christ is *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, not *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν*.

ܡܢܝܐ . To count. Said of the Nestorians who admitted two persons and two natures in Christ. ܐܬܡܢܝ ܠܡܢܝܢܗ. He was considered to his own count, independent, sui juris.

ܡܫܝܚܝܘܬܐ . Unction; Christianity. Applied to Zeno by Philoxenus as a title of honor.

ܢܩܦ. To adhere, in the 'Aphel, to join. Used in describing the mere moral union of the natures taught by the Nestorians concerning the Incarnation.

ܣܝܠܘܢܐ. Tube, channel. The Eutychians said that by the Incarnation the Word passed through the Virgin as through a channel without taking His body from her.

ܥܬܝܩܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ. The old (unredeemed) man.

ܦܓܪ. Corpse; living body. Generally used in speaking of the body of Christ.

ܦܠܓ. To divide. The Nestorians divided Christ into two persons.

ܦܪܫ. To separate; to distinguish. Said of the Nestorians who distinguished two persons in Christ, and of the Catholics who admitted two natures.

ܨܒܝܢܐ. Will. The Monophysites admit only one will in Christ.

ܪܒܝܥܝܘܬܐ. Quaternity. Noun formed from ܐܪܒܥܐ (four). Because they admitted two persons in Christ, the Nestorians were accused of adding a fourth person to the Trinity, thus making it a quaternity.

ܪ̈ܡܬܐ. The noble, exalted things. Said of the properties of the divine nature of Christ, and stands in opposition to ܡ̈ܟܝܟܬܐ.

ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ. Glory, praise. It also designates the Trisagion, which, for the Monophysites, includes the words « Who wast crucified for us », added by Peter the Fuller.

APPENDIX III

BIBLE QUOTATIONS COMPARED WITH THE PESHITTA AND WHEN POSSIBLE WITH THE CODEX SINAITICUS [1].

Deut., v. 7, (p. 142).	ܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܠܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܘܟܪܝܐ .	Phil.
	ܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܠܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢܝ .	P.
Malach., III, 6, (pp. 133, 166, 167):	ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܫܬܚܠܦܬ .	Phil.
	ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܡܪܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܫܬܚܠܦܬ .	
	ܡܛܠ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܡܪܝܐ . ܘܠܐ ܐܬܚܠܦܬ .	P.
Matth., I, 1, (p. 154):	ܒܪ ܕܘܝܕ ܘܒܪ ܐܒܪܗܡ .	Phil.
	ܒܪܗ ܕܕܘܝܕ . ܒܪܗ ܕܐܒܪܗܡ .	P.
	Same as P.	S.
Matth., III, 17, (p. 169):	ܗܢܘ ܒܪܝ ܚܒܝܒ .	Phil.
	ܗܢܘ ܒܪܝ ܚܒܝܒܐ .	P.

[1] The following abbreviations are used:

Phil. = Philoxenus.
P. = Peshitta.
S. = Codex Sinaiticus. (A. S. Lewis, *Some Pages of the Four Gospels* etc. London, 1896).

S. ܐܢܬ ܗܘ ܒܪܝ ܘܚܒܝܒܝ.

Phil. ܡܕܡ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܒܚܫܘܟܐ: Matth., X, 27, (p. 128)
ܐܘܡܪܘܗܝ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܒܢܗܝܪܐ. ܘܡܕܡ ܕܒܐܕ̈ܢܝܟܘܢ
ܫܡܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܐܟܪܙܘ ܥܠ ܐܓܪ̈ܐ.

P. ܡܕܡ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܒܚܫܘܟܐ: ܐܘܡܪܘܗܝ
ܐܢܬܘܢ ܒܢܘܗܪܐ. ܘܡܕܡ ܕܒܐܕ̈ܢܝܟܘܢ ܫܡܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ:
ܐܟܪܙܘ ܥܠ ܐܓܪ̈ܐ.

S. ܡܕܡ ܕܐܡܪܢܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܒܚܫܘܟܐ ܐܡܪܘܗܝ ܐܢܬܘܢ
ܒܢܘܗܪܐ. ܘܡܕܡ ܕܫܡܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܒܐܕܢܝܟܘܢ ܐܟܪܙܘ
ܥܠ ܐܓܪ̈ܐ.

Phil. ܠܐ ܬܕܚܠܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܩܛܠܝܢ :Matth., X, 28 (p. 128)
ܦܓܪܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܠܡܩܛܠ.

P. ܘܠܐ ܬܕܚܠܘܢ. ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܩܛܠܝܢ ܦܓܪܐ: ܢܦܫܐ
ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܠܡܩܛܠ.

S. ܘܠܐ ܬܕܚܠܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܩܛܠܝܢ ܦܓܪܐ. ܘܢܦܫܐ
ܠܐ ܫܠܝܛܝܢ ܠܡܩܛܠ.

Phil. ܡܢ ܕܢܘܕܐ ܒܝ ܩܕܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ :Matth. X, 32-33 (p. 128)
ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܐܘܕܐ ܒܗ ܩܕܡ ܐܒܝ ܕܒܫܡܝܐ. ܘܩܕܡ
ܡܠܐܟ̈ܘܗܝ. ܘܡܢ ܕܢܟܦܘܪ ܒܝ: ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܐܟܦܘܪ ܒܗ
ܩܕܡ ܐܒܐ ܘܩܕܡ ܡܠܐܟ̈ܐ [1].

---

[1] This quotation is a combination of St. Matthew, X, 32-33, and of St. Luke, XII, 8-9.

P. ܟܠܢܫ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܢܘܕܐ ܒܝ ܩܕܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ: ܐܘܕܐ ܒܗ
ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܩܕܡ ܐܒܝ ܕܒܫܡܝܐ. ܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܢܟܦܘܪ ܒܝ
ܩܕܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ: ܐܟܦܘܪ ܒܗ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܩܕܡ ܐܒܝ
ܕܒܫܡܝܐ.

S. ܟܠ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܢܘܕܐ ܒܝ. ܐܦ ܐܘܕܐ ܒܗ ܩܕܡ ܐܒܝ
ܕܒܫܡܝܐ. ܘܡܢ ܕܢܟܦܘܪ ܒܝ ܩܕܡ ܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ
ܐܟܦܘܪ ܒܗ ܩܕܡ ܐܒܝ ܕܒܫܡܝܐ.

Matth., XVI, 24 (p. 159): ܡܢ ܕܨܒܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܠܝ Phil.
ܬܠܡܝܕܐ: ܢܟܦܘܪ ܒܢܦܫܗ. ܘܢܫܩܘܠ ܙܩܝܦܗ. ܘܢܐܬܐ ܒܬܪܝ.

P. ܡܢ ܕܨܒܐ ܕܢܐܬܐ ܒܬܪܝ: ܢܟܦܘܪ ܒܢܦܫܗ. ܘܢܫܩܘܠ
ܙܩܝܦܗ ܘܢܐܬܐ ܒܬܪܝ.

S. Wanting.

Matth., XXVIII, 19 (pp. 142, 172): ܦܘܩܘ [ܠܟܘܢ] ܬܠܡܕܘ Phil.
ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܥܡ̈ܡܐ ܘܐܥܡܕܘ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܫܡ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ
ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ.

ܦܘܩܘ ܬܠܡܕܘ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܥܡ̈ܡܐ ܘܐܥܡܕܘ ܐܢܘܢ
ܒܫܡ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ.

P. ܙܠܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܬܠܡܕܘ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܥܡ̈ܡܐ. ܘܐܥܡܕܘ
ܐܢܘܢ: ܒܫܡ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ.

S. Wanting.

Mark, XV, 34 (p. 171): ܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܗܝ ܠܡܢܐ ܫܒܩܬܢܝ. Phil.

P. ܐܝܠ ܐܝܠ ܠܡܢܐ ܫܒܩܬܢܝ.

ܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܗܝ ܠܡܢܐ ܫܒܩܬܢܝ. S.

Luke, I, 31 (p. 154): ܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܒܟܪܣܐ . ܘܬܐܠܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ Phil.
ܘܬܩܪܝܢ ܫܡܗ ܝܫܘܥ .

ܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܒܟܪܣܐ ܘܬܐܠܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ ܘܬܩܪܝܢ P.
ܫܡܗ ܝܫܘܥ .

Wanting. S.

Luke, XVII, 33 (p. 159): ܡܢ ܕܢܒܥܐ ܕܢܚܝܐ ܢܦܫܗ Phil.
ܢܘܒܕܝܗ̇ . ܘܡܢ ܕܢܘܒܕ ܢܦܫܗ ܗܢܐ ܡܚܝܐ ܠܗ̇ .

ܡܿܢ ܕܢܒܥܐ ܕܢܚܝܐ ܢܦܫܗ ܢܘܒܕܝܗ̇ . ܘܡܢ ܕܢܘܒܕ ܢܦܫܗ P.
ܢܚܝܝܗ̇ .

Same as P. S.

Luke, XXIII, 46 (p. 169): ܐܒܐ ܒܐܝ̈ܕܝܟ ܣܐܡ Phil.
ܐܢܐ ܠܗ ܪܘܚܝ .

ܐܒܐ ܒܐܝ̈ܕܝܟ ܣܐܡ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ ܠܪܘܚܝ .

ܐܒܝ ܒܐܝ̈ܕܝܟ ܣܐܡ ܐܢܐ ܪܘܚܝ . P.

ܐܒܐ ܒܝ̈ܕܝܟ ܣܐܡ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ ܠܪܘܚܝ . S.

John, I, 14 (pp. 167, 166): ܡܠܬܐ ܒܣܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܓܢ ܒܢ. Phil.

ܘܡܠܬܐ ܒܣܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܓܢ ܒܢ . P.

Wanting. S.

John, III, 16 (p. 137): ܗܟܢܐ ܐܚܒ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ. Phil.
ܕܠܒܪܗ ܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܝܗܒ ܥܠܦܘܗܝ .

ܗܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܒܪܗ ܚܣܝܪܐ ܗܘܬ. P.

ܗܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܒܪܗ ܚܣܝܪܗ ܗܘܬ. S.

John, V, 17 (p. 156): ܐܒܝ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܗܫܐ ܥܒܕ ∴ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܥܒܕ ܐܢܐ. Phil.

Same. P.

ܐܒܝ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܗܫܐ ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܥܒܕ ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܥܒܕ ܐܢܐ. S.

John, X, 18 (p. 171): ܫܠܝܛ ܐܢܐ ܥܠ ܢܦܫܝ ܕܐܣܝܡܝܗ̇: ܘܫܠܝܛ ܐܢܐ ܕܬܘܒ ܐܣܒܝܗ̇. Phil.

ܫܠܝܛ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܣܝܡܝܗ̇: ܘܫܠܝܛ ܐܢܐ ܕܬܘܒ ܐܣܒܝܗ̇. P.

ܐܠܐ ܐܢܐ ܣܐܡ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܨܒܝ ܘܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܣܝܡܝܗ̇، ܘܬܘܒ ܐܫܩܠܝܗ̇. S.

John, X, 33 (p. 149): ܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܢܬ ܘܥܒܕ ܐܢܬ ܢܦܫܟ ܐܠܗܐ. Phil.

ܘܟܕ ܐܢܬܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ: ܥܒܕ ܐܢܬ ܢܦܫܟ ܐܠܗܐ. P.

ܟܕ ܐܢܬ ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ... ܘܥܒܕ ܐܢܬ... ܐܠܗܐ. S.

John, XIV, 6 (p. 132): ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܫܪܪܐ ܘܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܚܝ̈ܐ. Phil.

ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܘܫܪܪܐ ܘܚܝ̈ܐ. P.

Same as P. S.

Acts, II, 33 (p. 157): ܒܝܡܝܢܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܬܪܝܡ. Phil.
ܘܢܣܒ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܫܘܘܕܝܐ ܕܥܠ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ.

ܘܗܘܝܘ ܕܒܝܡܝܢܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܬܪܝܡ. ܘܢܣܒ ܡܢ P.
ܐܒܐ ܫܘܘܕܝܐ ܕܥܠ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ.

Romans, I, 4 (p. 171): ܐܬܝܕܥ [ܠܢ] ܒܪܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ Phil.
ܒܚܝܠܐ ܘܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܡܢ ܩܝܡܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ.

ܘܐܬܝܕܥ ܒܪܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ: ܒܚܝܠ ܘܒܪܘܚ ܩܘܕܫ. P.
ܕܩܡ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܪܢ.

Romans, v. 10 (p. 137): ܐܬܪܥܝ ܥܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܡܘܬܐ Phil.
ܕܒܪܗ.

Same P.

Romans, VIII, 32 (pp. 137, 152): ܐܢ ܥܠ ܒܪܗ ܠܐ Phil.
ܚܣ. ܐܠܐ ܚܠܦ ܟܠܢ ܐܫܠܡܗ. [ܐܫܠܡܗ ܚܠܦ. ܟܠܢ].
ܥܠ ܒܪܗ ܠܐ ܚܣ. ܐܠܐ ܐܫܠܡܗ ܚܠܦ ܟܠܢ.

ܘܐܢ ܥܠ ܒܪܗ ܠܐ ܚܣ: ܐܠܐ ܚܠܦ ܟܠܢ ܐܫܠܡܗ. P.

Romans, VIII, 38-39 (p. 130): ܡܦܝܣ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܠܐ Phil.
ܡܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܘܠܐ ܫܘܠ̈ܛܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܝ̈ܠܐ. ܘܠܐ
ܪܘܡܐ ܘܠܐ ܥܘܡܩܐ. ܘܠܐ ܕܩܝ̈ܡܢ ܘܠܐ ܕܥܬܝ̈ܕܢ.
ܡܫܟܚܢ ܦܪ̈ܫܢ ܠܢ ܡܢ ܚܘܒܗ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܐ.

ܡܦܝܣ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ. ܕܠܐ ܡܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܝ̈ܐ. ܘܠܐ P.
ܡܠܐܟ̈ܐ. ܘܠܐ ܫܘܠ̈ܛܢܐ. ܘܠܐ ܚܝ̈ܠܐ. ܘܠܐ
ܕܩܝ̈ܡܢ ܘܠܐ ܕܥܬܝ̈ܕܢ. ܘܠܐ ܪܘܡܐ ܘܠܐ ܥܘܡܩܐ.

ܘܐܦܠܐ ܒܪܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ. ܬܚܡܣܝܢ ܬܦܪܫܝܢ ܡܢ ܚܘܒܗ
ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܒܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ.

Romans, X, 9 (p. 159): ܐܘܕܐ ܒܦܘܡܟ ܒܡܪܢ Phil.
ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܗܝܡܢ ܒܠܒܟ.

ܘܐܢ ܬܘܕܐ ܒܦܘܡܟ ܒܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ: ܘܬܗܝܡܢ P.
ܒܠܒܟ.

1 Corinth., XVI. 22 (p. 144): ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܪܚܡ ܠܡܪܢ Phil.
ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܚܪܡ.

Same. P.

2 Corinth., V, 19 (p. 152) : ܐܠܗܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܫܝܚܐ Phil.
ܐܬܪܥܝ ܠܥܠܡܐ.

ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܒܡܫܝܚܐ: ܗܘ ܕܪܥܝ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܥܡ P.
ܪܒܘܬܗ.

Galatians, I, 1 (p. 171): ܐܠܗܐ [ܠܡ] ܐܒܘܗܝ. ܗܘ̇ Phil.
ܕܐܩܝܡܗ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ.

ܘܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܘܗܝ، ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܩܝܡܗ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ. P.

Philip. III, 19 (p. 148): ܐܠܗܗܘܢ ܟܪܣܗܘܢ ܘܬܫܒܘܚܬܗܘܢ Phil.
ܒܒܗܬܬܗܘܢ. ܬܪܥܝܬܗܘܢ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܗܝ.

ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܠܗܗܘܢ ܟܪܣܗܘܢ ܘܬܫܒܘܚܬܗܘܢ P.
ܒܒܗܬܬܗܘܢ. ܗܢܘܢ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܗܘܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܗܝ.

John, I, 1-3 (p. 140): ܡܚܘܪܢܝܢ ܠܟܘܢ [ܠܡ] ܠܗܘ Phil.
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܒܪܫܝܬ [ܐܡܪ ܗܘܝܢ ܒܐܢܓܠܝܘܢܗ] ܗܘ

ܕܫܡܫܢ ܘܚܙܝܢ ܒܒܢܝ̈ܢܝܢ ܚܙܝ ܘܡܠܟ ܒܐܪ̈ܙܝܢ. ܗܘ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܠܬܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ. ܘܚܝ̈ܐ ܐܬܓܠܝܘ. ܘܚܙܝܢ
ܘܡܫܡܫܢܝܢ. ܘܡܒܪܟܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܠܥܠܡ. ܗܢܘܢ
ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ ܘܐܬܓܠܝܘ ܠܢ.

P. ܡܫܒܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܫܝܬ.
ܗܘ ܕܫܡܫܢ ܘܚܙܝܢܘܗܝ، ܒܒܢܝ̈ܢ. ܚܙܝ ܘܡܠܟ ܒܐܪ̈ܙܝܢ.
ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܠܬܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ. ܘܚܝ̈ܐ ܐܬܓܠܝܘ. ܘܚܙܝܢ
ܘܫܡܫܢܝܢ. ܘܡܒܪܟܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܠܥܠܡ. ܗܢܘܢ
ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ. ܘܐܬܓܠܝܘ ܠܢ.

GREEK WORDS OCCURRING IN THE THREE LETTERS.

ἀγών PP. 131 l. 6; 145 l. 5; 157 l. 21; 158 l. 6.
ἀθλητής PP. 131 l. 6; 155 l. 22; 156 l. 3.
αἱρεσιώτης PP. 159 l. 3; 160 l. 22; 173 l. 2.
αἱρετικός PP. 171 l. 5; 173 l. 11.
ἀναφορά P. 158 l. 20.
γάζα P. 147 l. 19.
γένος PP. 129 l. 18; 146 l. 2.
ἐπίσκοπος P. 158 l. 19.
ἰδιώτης P. 146 l. 9.
κατηγορέω P. 173 l. 11.
κοιτών P. 144 l. 3.
οὐσία P. 152 l. 12.
συνήγορος PP. 143 l. 12; 144 l. 6.
σχῆμα PP. 147 ll. 11, 17; 159 l. 6; 161 ll. 19, 14.
τάξις P. 164 l. 18.
τιμή P. 148 l. 5.
τύπος P. 147 l. 13.
φαντασία P. 133 l. 20.

THE END

ERRATA		CORRIGE
Pag. 150 l. ult. ܡܟܠܐܪ	. . . .	ܡܟܠܐܕ
Pag. 153 l. ult. ܪܡܣܘ	. . . . .	This reading is doubtful. The ms. reads more probably ܪܘܡܣܘ, although the ܘ is so small as to be easily mistaken for a ܡ.